

3
1120

DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1120

December 12, 1960

FOREIGN POLICY AND NEWS RESPONSIBILITY • by
Assistant Secretary Berding 883

**SOME ASPECTS OF PRIVATE FOREIGN INVEST-
MENT • by Eric H. Hager, Legal Adviser 890**

**TRADE COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENTS NOTICE ON
GATT NEGOTIATIONS**
TAC Announcement 897
Notice of Intention To Negotiate 899
Notice of Public Hearings 900

**U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACCEPTS CREDENTIALS
OF CONGOLESE PRESIDENT KASAVUBU • State-
ments by James W. Barco and James J. Wadsworth 904**

For index see inside back cover

CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY
DEC 27 1960
DOCUMENTS SECTION X

SPECIAL
RECORD
ED STATES
IGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIII, No. 1120 • PUBLICATION 7108

December 12, 1960

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:

52 Issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Foreign Policy and News Responsibility

by Andrew H. Berding
*Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs*¹

You have asked me to talk today on the subject of "Foreign Policy and News Responsibility." To me this responsibility is reciprocal. The Government has a responsibility to the press, the press a responsibility to the Government. I shall talk on both. And I cannot imagine a more crucial time to do so.

Today some of the world's ideas about the United States have been shaken by Soviet scientific achievements. Some quarters of the world now doubt that the United States can produce anything it wants better and faster than anyone else. At the same time the Soviets have sought to inculcate the belief that they are more interested than we are in the independence and development of the newer nations. The U.S.S.R. has sought, with partial success, to establish itself as the protagonist of change, progress, and development. The United States, on the other hand, tends to be regarded by some as standing for slow and cautious betterment or as defending what they consider the evils of the past.

On the other hand, the United States represents to many people the most important force standing for political freedom and constitutional government. Its advanced industrial society is widely admired for spreading its benefits among all classes of people. Many less developed countries have benefited from United States technical experience and economic resources, and their leaders have been deeply influenced by American institutions and ideas. Wherever moderate solutions are favored, as opposed to extremes, our objectives

are highly regarded even when our methods and actions may be criticized.

Nevertheless the Soviet Union has appealed successfully to the emotional needs of many peoples. It has gained credit for its oversimplified approach to disarmament. It has closely identified itself with the interests of the colored peoples. It has consistently supported Afro-Asian nationalism against colonial rule. It has advertised its economic progress and that of Communist China as a demonstration of the effectiveness of Communist methods.

The Soviet Union and Communist China have had less difficulty, of course, in raising themselves in world opinion than the United States has had in retaining or advancing its position. A higher standard of behavior for the United States has actually created a double standard, which is sometimes manifested in the United Nations. If we behave well, that is only what was expected of us, and we get no credit. If the Soviets behave badly, that was only what was expected of them; they get little blame, and some delegates are willing to make concessions to induce them to behave better.

Because the United States is richer we are expected to be more forthcoming with aid. Because we threw off colonial rule we are expected to give all-out support to any nationalist cause.

Moreover, because of our democratic processes, our freedom of speech and freedom of the press, our shortcomings are more apparent to the world. We cannot, as our competitors often do, hide our race problems, adjust our trade policies, or make foreign policy decisions without regard to competing foreign and domestic interests.

Unceasingly Soviet and Chinese Communist

¹ Address made before the Associated Press Managing Editors Association at Williamsburg, Va., on Nov. 18 (press release 649).

rulers do their utmost to highlight the adverse images of the United States and the favorable images of the Soviet bloc in both the developed and less developed areas of the world.

It is against this background that I talk to you about the reciprocal responsibilities of the Government and the press in the field of foreign affairs.

The Government's Responsibilities

On the Government's side the responsibility is, first, to put out the maximum amount of information promptly and comprehensively. I have long been convinced that we can get the message of our foreign policy across to our own and other peoples one hundred times more effectively through the commercial media such as press, radio-TV, and magazines than we can through our own governmental distribution methods such as pamphlets.

Further, since our foreign relations today involve consultation with many other nations, it is a practical fact that if we do not put out the news promptly then someone else will. And the news will be of his complexion, not ours.

The second responsibility is to make this information understandable. Foreign affairs are ever more complicated. Simply putting out a press release or making an oral announcement is not enough. Sufficient background information should be provided so that the event becomes clear and the reason for it, the background of it, the results expected from it, are shown in perspective.

This is particularly true of our vast economic relationships. In general the press and public seem to be more interested in—and therefore they better comprehend—political and military developments. Thus an added responsibility devolves upon the Government to make economic developments both interesting and comprehensible.

I do not believe in leaks. If a correspondent comes to us with a tip he already has, we will help him to the degree we can. But deliberately to hand a story to a correspondent because he is a favorite or because he represents a powerful newspaper or magazine, no. Official news is the property of no one official to give as largesse. It is the property of the Government as a whole to be given to the press as a whole.

Nor do I believe in trial balloons. Such ma-

neuvers may have been feasible in times past. But nowadays, with our lightning like communications, the launcher of a trial balloon scarcely has time to blink his eyes before his vehicle has turned into a rocket careening in orbit, with a dozen countries shooting at it. And by the time it has returned through the atmosphere, its mice have turned into monkeys.

I now turn to the responsibility of the press in the field of foreign affairs, which, I feel, is what you wish me to give greater attention to.

Responsibility of Selectivity

I should like to deal first with what I shall call the *responsibility of selectivity*. The problems faced by the press and the problems faced by the Department of State are similar in many ways—and above all, in their growing complexity.

When I was transferred in 1937 from being AP bureau chief in Rome to being chief AP correspondent at the State Department, the United States had diplomatic relations with 61 countries. In only 17 did we have ambassadors; in all the others, ministers. We were not members of the League of Nations or of the World Court; we had passed neutrality legislation to isolate ourselves from the world and the wars we felt were coming.

Today, 23 years later, the United States has diplomatic relations with 98 countries. In 94 of these we have ambassadors; in only 4 have we ministers. We are members of the United Nations, to which we have an ambassador and a large staff accredited. We are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization of American States, with ambassadors accredited there. We likewise have an ambassador to the European Community. We have mutual security alliances with 42 countries. We have spent nearly \$70 billion in foreign assistance since the war. We have worldwide economic and information programs. There are a million Americans overseas in official status. The Hoover Commission reported that 46 U.S. Government departments and agencies are involved in foreign relations.

The problems of the press in covering our foreign relations have grown accordingly. Again going back to 1937, when I went to the old State Department building alongside the White House, we had a little press room about the size of a nor-

mal hotel bedroom. It had four desks and half a dozen telephones.

This week we opened the new press room in the new State Department building. This room contains 50 desks and as many telephones. The Associated Press alone has 4 desks—exactly the total of all the desks in the old press room where I first worked. Today there are 200 correspondents accredited to the Department, of whom 150 are American, 50 foreign. And we have taken account of the new media, radio and TV, by installing a radio-TV studio.

You editors are fully acquainted with the almost insurmountable task of choosing the items of first and second importance from the mass of material that reaches the desk of your telegraph editor. We in the Department of State have the same task of sorting out and assigning priorities. On an average working day the Department of State receives and sends by cable and wireless almost exactly half a million words. In addition, many tens of thousands more come in and go out by airgram.

This responsibility for selectivity is going to increase, not diminish. New nations have come into being, others will come into being, with different backgrounds, different aspirations, united, however, in at least one burning desire—to be members of the United Nations and to speak their piece before the footlights of this world stage.

You and we both have a similar task—establishment of relations with the new countries. Our diplomatic personnel is being stretched to the very limit to find adequate representation to the new states. And I know that at the same time American news media are doing their utmost to find adequate correspondents for these countries.

We both have a responsibility to become better acquainted with the nations that have recently come into being. The continent of Africa is for each of us a whole study unto itself. And it cannot be neglected. Upon us both rests a tremendous responsibility of interpreting the African nations to our people and the United States to the African peoples.

Giving a True Image of America

I now come to what I might call *partial responsibility for the image of America*. The American news agencies and those American newspapers,

magazines, and news films that circulate widely abroad have an ever-increasing responsibility to give a true and balanced image of the United States to their overseas readers and viewers. As populations increase, as literacy grows, there will be ever-greater numbers of people interested in the American scene. Almost all of them will sincerely want to understand America. They will need your help.

The responsibility you have to give the American people a balanced picture of events in the United States is even greater when that news is sent abroad.

You might say, "We'll give them the news." I say, that is not enough. You and I know very well there are different ways of looking at the news. There is the viewpoint of the flashy journal, to whose editor all that is Hollywood, scandal, and crime is news. And there is the viewpoint of the great metropolitan daily, to whose editor the major, significant developments of the Nation, whether good or bad, are news. What we need consistently is that second viewpoint.

In my frequent travels with Secretaries Dulles and Herter I found that many foreign newspapers relish and will play to the utmost the scandal type of news they receive from American sources. You may say, "That's not our fault." Probably not, but it gives added force to what I have just said.

You may also say, "We try to be impartial; we give both sides of the story." Again I say, that is not enough. In the attempt to be impartial, one is often partial. For it is seldom that both sides of a story are of equal importance. And how infrequent it is that the sides of a story are limited to two. There may be many sides.

When so many tens of thousands of words were wirelessly overseas on the events at Little Rock several years ago, you might say, "We gave both sides of the story. We gave the side of the integrationists. We gave the side of the segregationists." And you could say the same with the current events in Louisiana. But did you give another side, what I would call the perspective side? Did you, for instance, point out that there are more Negroes attending universities in the United States than the total number of university students in any one of the major countries in Europe? More than twice as many, for example,

as all the university students in the United Kingdom? That there is public school integration in four-fifths of the States of the Union? That two-thirds of the students in the integrated public schools in the Nation's Capital are Negroes? (Today it is four-fifths.) That the average income of the Negro in the United States is many times the world average? That the Negro enjoys freedom of movement, assembly, speech, and amusement denied to half the people of the world?

Oh, I know that the situation is far from perfect. But it is also far better than the impression created by an impartial pro and con at Little Rock or now in Louisiana. Progress is being steadily made. This is what needs to be recorded, along with the setbacks and incidents. If it is treated intelligently, it can be news too.

As another example, the Soviet Union apparently enjoys the reputation in certain major countries of being well ahead of the United States in the exploration of outer space. This, of course, is owing to the great play given the first Soviet sputnik and the first American failures. But has enough attention been given to American outer-space achievements since then—not just each individual event but a constant summing up of where we stand? I find that people are always surprised when I tell them that in the last 3 years the United States has successfully put into earth orbit 28 satellites, as compared with the Soviets' 6, and 2 into solar orbit, as compared with the Soviets' 1, although the Soviets made 1 lunar impact, as compared with none for the United States. That there are still in earth orbit today 14 American satellites, as compared with the Soviets' 1. That 10 of these American satellites are even now transmitting information, whereas the Soviets' 1 is silent. That 2 American satellites are still in solar orbit, as compared with 1 for the Soviets. And finally that the American satellites have furnished far more useful information to the world scientific community than their Soviet counterparts.

I would therefore strongly recommend that a top news executive of any American organization sending news abroad, whether in teleprinted, printed, or film form, take a good look at that news at regular intervals. His motto should be "Perspective."

Avoiding the Opponent's Traps

I refer next to what I shall call *responsibility to avoid the opponent's traps*. As we know all too well, our opponent, Communist imperialism, uses a vocabulary which embraces words similar in appearance to those current among ourselves but diametrically opposed in meaning. If we ourselves simply pick up and repeat these words as they are uttered by Soviet spokesmen, we give them added currency and thus further the Soviets' game.

When the Communists speak of "peace," they do indeed mean peace—but their own variety. They mean Communist domination of the world, after which there will be peace. This Pax Sovietica might well ensue from Communist overlordship of the world, but it is not the kind of peace we want by any manner of means.

When Mr. Khrushchev speaks, as he so often does, of "peaceful coexistence," this is anything but peaceful. He himself has repeatedly said that "peaceful coexistence" simply means the absence of shooting war while the Communist countries continue a bitter struggle in the political, economic, and psychological fields until, as they say, communism eventually triumphs over capitalism.

When we see, as we frequently do, the phrase "the People's Democratic Republic" of this or that satellite country, what does this gobbledygook mean? The government of this "People's Democratic Republic" is certainly not of the people, it is not democratic, and it is not a republic. But almost daily we pass it on like a counterfeit bill from hand to hand.

When the Soviets proposed, as they did at *nauseam*, "ban the bomb," it was up to us in and out of Government to show how hollow this was. It involved no control, no reduction of nuclear arms, simply a generic promise for the little that was worth.

The Soviets repeatedly speak of theirs as a "Socialist" system or of themselves and the satellites as "Socialist" countries. Indiscriminately spreading this word plays into the hands of the Soviets by creating an analogy between them and countries which are, in fact, Socialist. Such, among others, are the Scandinavian countries, which are our very good friends and strongly anti-Communist.

There are many other words and phrases and ideas in the same category.

The responsibility of both of us is to see that, if these words are used, they are appropriately dubbed as Communist nomenclature and from time to time exposed for the Halloween masks they are. At the very least, quotation marks should put them in Coventry.

Discarding Old Ideas

I turn now to a further responsibility—the responsibility to discard old ideas. What I have in mind can best be shown through examples.

Too much is printed about a direct U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. conflict, struggle for power, struggle for prestige. But the antagonism existing in the world today is not just between these two countries. It is between the free world and the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Constant emphasis on the purely bilateral struggle ignores the strong physical assistance we receive from our allies and the moral assistance we receive from the majority of nations in the free world which are not our allies. On the economic side it ignores the fact that since the war the major Western European nations have actually developed faster than the Soviet Union. This is true also of Japan and Yugoslavia.

Again, too much is printed about blocs—particularly an African bloc, an Asian bloc, or an Afro-Asian bloc. Mr. Khrushchev spoke of the existence in the United Nations of three blocs—first, the Soviet bloc, second, what he called the capitalist bloc, and third, what he called the neutralist bloc. In fact, however, there is only one bloc—the Soviet bloc. This group votes solidly; it follows orders. But not so with the so-called capitalist bloc, within which there are many differences and voting patterns. And not so with the so-called neutralist bloc, within which again there are many differences and voting patterns.

As to the neutralist nations, the impression is too often given that these nations, as a group, lean neither to the Soviet bloc nor to the Western nations. This tends to give their foreign policy a negative coloration, which they justly resent. The fact is that in great majority they are neutralist only in that they have not joined the mutual security system of the Western Powers and their allies or that of the Soviet bloc. They are not

neutralist when it comes to deciding in favor of the human values of freedom and the dignity of the individual, as espoused by the United States and its friends, versus the domination of the state, as espoused by the Soviet Union. It would be better to speak of these nations simply as unaligned.

Responsibility to the Government

Another responsibility I should like to comment on can be called *responsibility to the Government*. One aspect of such responsibility has to do with the publication by newspapers of the texts of documents which are highly classified.

These documents, as per regulations, are marked on each page at the top and at the bottom "Top Secret," "Secret," or "Confidential," depending on the degree of classification. There can be no doubt in the newspaper editors' minds that the documents are classified.

When these documents are published, the newspapers themselves generally state that they are "Secret" or "Confidential" papers, and yet they proceed to print them in full. They do so without any intimation of excuse or explanation. They do so without any inquiry of any Government agency as to whether the publication would injure our relations with other countries mentioned in the documents or impair the standing of our Nation.

Since documents so classified have only official circulation, it is obvious that a Government official, in violation of the rules of official conduct and of ethics, has given them to unauthorized persons. The newspapers condone this violation by making the most of it.

In the scores of columns of space devoted to the classified documents that have been published I have yet to see any slightest question of whether it was right or wrong to publish secret official documents.

You might say, "Well, the Government should not have marked the documents 'Secret' or 'Confidential.'" Even if that be admitted, it is legitimate to ask, does the newspaper have the sovereign right to determine by itself that the Government is wrong when it wants to protect national security by classifying a document? I am more than willing to grant that documents are often unnecessarily classified or too highly classified, although

considerable improvement has been registered in the right direction in recent years. But once the document is in fact classified, a newspaper takes upon itself a special responsibility when it publishes it.

What makes me wonder is less the fact of this publication than the disturbing fact that no one seems to think it in any way unusual.

Further as to responsibility to the Government, I should like to make this simple appeal: Once in a while give your Government a break. I cannot ask you to obey the old toast, "My country, right or wrong." But I do ask you not to follow the line, "My country, always wrong." This may sound too sweeping, and probably it is, but I get the impression that a few correspondents concentrate their major attention on stories that show the Government in a bad light.

Several years ago I heard a leading American correspondent say that he slanted his stories 5 percent against the Government because he believed that official press releases were slanted in favor of the Government. To this I can have no objection. In fact it is probably all to the good that press stories be slightly more on the critical than on the commendatory side. This serves to keep officials more on their toes.

But serious objection can be raised to the story that is heavily slanted against the Government because the correspondent believes that a better headline can be obtained with material of conflict, confusion, or the unfavorable.

Contribution of a Free Press

I have now spoken of our reciprocal responsibilities.

In closing I want to say that I am constantly surprised that the American press carries out its task as competently and comprehensively as it does. Nowhere in the world is there anything to compare in width and depth with the coverage of events given by major American newspapers.

In my opinion there is no more valuable a person in the world today than the reporter who conscientiously, intelligently, and accurately portrays events as he sees them. To me he ranks equal with the top Government officials, the diplomats, the scientists, the outstanding professional men, the business and labor leaders, in the contribution he makes to world progress.

In the same high rank is the editor with capacity for selection, judgment, and presentation.

Thomas Jefferson said that, as between a government without newspapers and newspapers without a government, he would choose the latter. The former, of course, would be tyranny, the latter anarchy. I cannot see the day when our people would have to make this choice.

The solution that will last throughout the ages is: responsibility of the Government to a free press and the people, and responsibility of a free press to the Nation.

U.S. Positions Naval Units as Aid to Guatemala and Nicaragua

*Statement by James C. Hagerty
Press Secretary to the President*¹

In response to requests of the Governments of Guatemala and Nicaragua, surface and air units of the United States Navy are in a position in which they could assist these Governments, should it become necessary, to seek out and prevent intervention on the part of Communist-directed elements in the internal affairs of Guatemala and Nicaragua through the landing of armed forces or supplies from abroad.

President Asks Mr. Voorhees To Study Cuban Refugee Problem

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated November 10

Recently a newly formed group of citizens of Dade County, Fla.—the Cuban Refugee Committee—requested the President's assistance in problems relating to more than 30,000 Cuban refugees now in this country.

On November 10 the President asked Tracy Voorhees to act as his personal representative to look into the situation for him and to report to him. The President asked Mr. Voorhees to undertake this assignment because of his experience in refugee matters, particularly in acting as the President's representative for the Hungarian ref-

¹Made to news correspondents at Augusta, Ga., on Nov. 17.

ugees and as chairman of the President's Committee for Hungarian Refugee Relief.

It has long been the policy of the United States to grant asylum to refugees fleeing from political persecution and oppression. In the case of Cuba, the United States now is the country of first asylum for a large number of refugees who have sought a safe haven on our shores.

The several interested Federal departments have been actively working with appropriate State and local agencies to provide guidance and assistance within the purview of their regular programs. While this problem must in the main continue to be dealt with locally, further study of it seems warranted to assess the extent and acuteness of the situation and to determine if there are any additional steps that may be needed to deal with it on a coordinated basis.

Stage-Two Talks on West Indies Bases Open on Island of Tobago

Press release 655 dated November 23

Delegations from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the federation of The West Indies will hold stage-two negotiations on West Indies bases beginning November 28 on the island of Tobago. Stage-one talks were held at London November 3-8, 1960.¹

The chairman of the U.S. delegation to the stage-two talks will be the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, John Hay Whitney. His deputy will be Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Ivan B. White. Other delegation members will be Edwin G. Moline, Consul General at Port-of-Spain, James W. Swihart, Officer in Charge of U.K. Affairs and British West Indies Affairs, Department of State, Francis J. Galbraith, political officer, American Embassy, London, and Gordon A. Harrison, press officer, U.S. Information Service, London. Also included in the American delegation will be representatives from the Depart-

¹ For text of a communique, see BULLETIN of Nov. 28, 1960, p. 822.

ment of Defense and the International Cooperation Administration. Heading the Defense group will be William E. Lang, Director of the Office of Foreign Military Rights Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense. He will be accompanied by Rear Adm. W. M. McCormick, Assistant Director of the Political Military Policy Division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, William Hancock, Assistant General Counsel for International and Civil Aviation Matters, and Lt. Col. A. A. Olson, Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Capt. Earl A. Luehman, USN, commanding officer of the Naval Station at Chaguaramas, will also assist the Defense group. The representative from ICA will be Rollin S. Atwood, Regional Director for Latin America.

The West Indies bases originally were made available to the United States under terms of the 1941 leased-bases agreement between the United States and Britain. Stage-one talks held at London laid out the broad areas of study and established certain basic working principles. The stage-two discussions will consider the general principles developed among the three delegations at the London meetings and will work out detailed plans for implementing them.

Albanian Independence Day

Department Statement

Press release 658 dated November 25, for release November 27

On November 28 free Albanians celebrate the 48th anniversary of Albanian independence. On this date in 1912, after long years of struggle against oppression, a free and independent Albania was established. Today, unfortunately, the Albanian people are deprived of national independence and the enjoyment of their fundamental human rights and are under the heel of a totalitarian regime subservient to an alien power. In commemorating the anniversary of Albanian independence, the United States reaffirms its support for the Albanian people in their struggle for liberty and looks forward to the time when Albania will once more be independent.

Some Aspects of Private Foreign Investment

by *Eric H. Hager*
*Legal Adviser*¹

It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to discuss with you this afternoon a subject which is of vital interest to both Government and business—American private investment abroad and its relationship to our foreign economic policy.

Before I begin, it is only fair to tell you that I will be speaking on a subject which does not fall directly within my area of official responsibility. The Legal Adviser of the Department of State does not formulate foreign economic policy, and he has very little to do with its implementation. In the State Department in Washington the responsibility for carrying out our foreign economic policy on a worldwide basis, and more particularly the promotion and protection of our private investment abroad, is centered primarily in our Bureau of Economic Affairs and particularly the Economic Development Division of that bureau.

However, certain aspects of this general subject do come to the attention of the Department's lawyers from time to time, as for instance the negotiation of certain types of international agreements or the espousal of claims against other governments or the interpretation of our own laws in the economic field. We have a number of able lawyers in the Department who are experts in those various subjects and they do their best to educate me, but I am still not a specialist and so my discussion of private foreign investment is going to be on a somewhat general basis.

A Fundamental Aim of U.S. Foreign Policy

What is the nature of the interrelationship between the foreign economic policy of the United States and American private investment abroad?

¹ Address made before the foreign investment session of the 47th National Foreign Trade Convention at New York, N.Y., on Nov. 15.

Where are their aims and interests similar, and how does each work for the benefit of the other?

One of the most fundamental aims of our foreign policy is, of course, to make the free world strong and to maintain its freedom. In order to remain free it must continue to grow and develop economically. This is particularly true of the newly developing countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. They are properly ambitious for the higher living standards and also the political and economic freedom that characterize our more mature society. They are looking for ways in which they can achieve these aims.

We know that economic development should not depend solely on governmental activity. Government, of course, has a significant role, but the best system is the one where the Government provides the opportunity and the incentive so that private persons and organizations can play the important part for which they are naturally best equipped. Through such a system we in the United States have achieved the highest standard of living in the world and at the same time maintained our essential freedoms of thought, expression, and religion. We believe that this type of system will provide the best answer for the newly developing countries.

Challenge to Free-World Business

However, there are also certain other nations in the field competing with us for the hearts and minds of these new countries in the hope that they can ultimately harness the manpower and natural resources of these countries to the Soviet system. These newly developing nations offer a tremendous opportunity for communism in its unceasing drive to dominate the world. If they do not move forward economically at an acceptable rate, the Sino-Soviet bloc will surely seek to capitalize on

their frustration and discontent and gradually move in with its puppets and take over the control of their governments and economies. The result could be, for the free-world countries, far-reaching strategic consequences and, for free-world business, the loss of important markets, sources of raw materials, and investment opportunities.

Thus these newly developing countries present a danger area, but they also offer a challenge and an opportunity. Their economic aspirations are not going to be denied. One way or another they are going to move forward and offer important new markets for trade and new opportunities for investment, if not to private business then to governments. Their economic development thus poses a challenge both to the free world and to the Soviet countries. Their basic commercial and economic ties in future years are going to be with those who rise to meet this challenge successfully.

The newly developing countries require a great many things. They need technical assistance in education, agriculture, industry, and public administration. They need the fundamental economic base on which all further development has to depend: the roads, harbor facilities, dams, power grids, and communications networks. These and many others are needs which the governments of other countries, acting individually or through multilateral effort, can help to fulfill.

Contribution of American Private Business

Essential as they are, however, government measures, resources, and capabilities are not by themselves going to be completely adequate for the task of guiding these newly developing countries toward a higher standard of living in a free society. There is also a necessary contribution which private business can make. The really great assets of our economy—the initiative, resourcefulness, technical ability, and managerial know-how which characterize the private sector—must also be brought to bear on their problems. Therefore one of the major elements of our foreign economic policy has been the encouragement of American private investment in the newly developing countries as a means of strengthening and accelerating their economic growth and fostering the development of free private enterprise there.

Assuming that conditions are sufficiently favorable to encourage American private investment, what is the contribution that it can make to the newly developing countries? It will find its most important role in the production and distribution of goods and services. It will invest in and manage farms, mines, factories, and distribution networks. It will contribute the capital to create new production facilities, the technical skills, know-how, and engineering talent to operate them, and the managerial and organization talent to direct the effort. It will contribute the ingenuity and resourcefulness, the dynamic drive, which has always characterized American business. I should also add that the adaptability of American business is a uniquely important quality in the highly diverse newly developing areas of the world, where no single approach to economic problems holds the key to success.

American foreign investment will also set in motion a chain reaction in the local economy. It will stimulate constructive economic activity, increase the supply of local technical ability, and ultimately contribute to the formation and growth of local private enterprise. In short, it will accelerate the process of economic development and guide it into the proper direction.

Special Problems Presented

There are great needs and opportunities for private investment in the less developed countries. On the other hand, these countries also offer formidable problems of a special nature. They present many of the familiar deterrents to private investment abroad, often in a most extreme form. We may find a lack of natural resources, the limitations imposed by a small market, a tax structure which is unattractive in view of the admittedly greater risks, foreign exchange problems, high initial exploratory costs, and often a host of difficult legal problems resulting from recently achieved independence and severance of ties with another country.

Experience has shown that a large amount of investment will flow to industrialized nations without any special incentives. This is demonstrated by the trend of new American direct investment abroad, which has been heavily concentrated in Canada and Western Europe. Relatively very little capital has been flowing into the less

developed countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, and a substantial share of that has been petroleum investment, with comparatively little investment in other fields. Latin America, though also less developed, has nevertheless received a heavy flow of American capital, but this is an exceptional situation due to long and close association.

Measures To Encourage Private Investment

In those newly developing countries in whose future progress the United States has such a compelling foreign policy interest, the obstacles to private investment are so extensive that capital cannot be expected to enter in sufficient quantity without some Government assistance. What measures does the United States Government take to encourage private investment in the newly developing countries?

Perhaps the oldest of our measures to encourage business abroad are the commercial treaties, which provide a general framework for trade and investment. These are commonly called treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation—FCN treaties, for short—because of the three principal subjects which they cover, but they often cover consular rights as well. They are the oldest kind of treaty we have. The first one was entered into with France in 1778, before the States had even joined together in the Articles of Confederation. The oldest one which is still in force today is our treaty with Great Britain, entered into in 1815, almost 150 years ago. At the present time, we have FCN treaties with 38 countries, and FCN treaties with 3 more countries have been signed and are going through the ratification process. Ten additional ones are in various stages of negotiation. While the individual treaties differ somewhat from one another, as a general rule the more modern ones cover important business essentials by providing a right of entry to do business, special immigration status for traders and investors, protection against seizure of property without compensation, and a right to transfer earnings. In addition to negotiating these treaties our Government also has the task from time to time to see that their provisions are adhered to.

Moving from the oldest to some of the newer types of measures taken by the Government to foster private investment in the less developed countries, I would say that they break down into

the following general areas: assistance, exploration, finance, and taxation.

In the assistance area we have sought to furnish the technical assistance which would help to create a climate favorable to private enterprise. This involves advising countries, upon request, as to the elements which go to make up that kind of climate and assisting countries to establish local institutions designed to encourage private investment, such as industrial development centers, industrial research institutes, and development banks.

As to exploration, this involves measures taken to assist in the identification and examination of specific investment opportunities of interest to foreign investors and to bring such investment opportunities to the attention of the American business community through the established facilities of the Department of Commerce and other agencies.

Forms of Financial Assistance

Coming now to the area of finance, we find a number of instruments employed to encourage private investment in the less developed countries. First of all, there are loans by the Export-Import Bank and the Development Loan Fund. One important means of assistance to private enterprise development in the less developed areas is the kind of loan which contributes to the expansion of the basic public facilities which are so essential to private enterprise—roads, harbor facilities, and the like. In addition there are loans to private enterprise, directly or indirectly. DLF has made many loans either directly to private companies or else to finance capital goods imports for sale to private companies in the less developed countries. The Export-Import Bank finances transactions through medium-term exporter credits and also makes long-term development loans to private enterprise.

In addition to direct dollar loans there are also loans of foreign currencies realized from the sales of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities. Under the Cooley amendment to Public Law 480, up to 25 percent of the local currency received is generally made available for loans by the Export-Import Bank to American firms or their foreign subsidiaries or affiliates for possible development and trade expansion in the host country.

Another form of financial assistance to foreign

investment is the longstanding policy of extending financial support to foreign development financing institutions. Both the Export-Import Bank and the DLF have made many loans to development funds and development banks in the less developed countries.

Another measure in the financial field is ICA's [International Cooperation Administration] investment guaranty program, which makes available protection against the risks of loss due to expropriation, inconvertibility of exchange, and war. As of September 30 of this year a total of about \$545 million of guaranty contracts had been issued since the beginning of the program, of which about \$428 million were still in force. To date there has never been a single call on the guaranties. Guaranty contracts may now be written only for new investments in the less developed countries, as a result of an amendment to the law last year. As of today we have agreements under this program with 49 countries, and we are negotiating with 13 more, 7 of them in Africa and the others in Latin America or Asia.

In addition to the ICA program, DLF and the Export-Import Bank have authority to guarantee private loans for economic development projects.

The above are some of the financial means by which our Government seeks to encourage private investment in the less developed countries. If time would permit, another chapter could be devoted to the effect of our participation in such multilateral organizations in the financial area as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the International Monetary Fund, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank, and of the cooperation between U.S. Government agencies and those organizations.

Tax Treaties and Tax Legislation

Finally, in the area of the taxation of foreign investment, the Government is in favor of action by tax treaties and tax legislation.

The United States has tax treaties in effect with 21 countries, and treaties with 2 more are in the process of being ratified. New treaties or modifications of existing treaties are being negotiated with another dozen countries.

These treaties improve the climate for foreign investment by reducing the area of double taxat-

tion and providing for fiscal cooperation between the governments in tax matters. The greatest number of the 35 existing treaties relate to the taxation of income, but there are a dozen which deal with estate taxes and 2 relate to gift taxes.

In this connection it is appropriate to mention "tax sparing." Many of the less developed countries have enacted incentive laws to encourage new industry, including laws reducing or suspending host-country income taxes. The operation of our tax credit system, which gives credit for a foreign tax paid but not for the amount of a foreign tax reduction or suspension, can in effect frustrate this foreign tax incentive. We have sought to remove this nullifying effect of our own tax system by including in our tax treaties a provision by which U.S. tax credit would be given in appropriate circumstances for the amount of the foreign tax reduction, as if it had in fact been paid. One treaty now pending in the Senate, and another which is ready to go there, contain such tax-sparing provisions.

Regarding tax legislation, in connection with H.R. 5, in 1959, the administration supported in modified form the provision for deferment of U.S. tax on the foreign earnings of a foreign business corporation until those earnings were distributed in the United States in the form of dividends.² Tax deferment is believed to have a significant advantage over tax reduction, because it is felt that it will encourage investors to leave their profits abroad for reinvestment rather than repatriate them.

However, it was recommended that tax deferment be granted on a basis limited to operations in the less developed areas of the world and that the provision be limited in the case of companies engaged in exporting.

The administration also recommended enactment of a provision permitting deduction as an ordinary loss, within certain limits, of losses incurred by the original investor on stock of a foreign business corporation deriving substantially all of its income from the active conduct of a trade or business, utilizing plant and equipment, in one of the less developed countries.

² For statements made before the House Committee on Ways and Means by Under Secretary Dillon and David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, see BULLETIN of July 27, 1959, p. 128.

Finally, in addition to the FCN treaties and the other four areas already covered, I should also mention the normal day-to-day assistance to businessmen rendered by our embassies and consulates abroad. The economic and commercial officers in our foreign missions are responsible for furnishing businessmen with information and advice on investment conditions and opportunities in the countries in which they are stationed.

While it has not been possible in this space of time to go very deeply into any of the particular areas which I have mentioned, I believe that we have now covered substantially all of the more important ways in which the Government has sought to encourage American private investment in the less developed areas of the world and generally to bring about the application of private initiative to the economic development of those areas.

A Cooperative Effort

As I indicated earlier, however, this is not a task which can be accomplished by our Government alone, or by the host-country government alone, or indeed by private enterprise alone. Essentially it has to be a cooperative effort.

The newly developing host country must do its part to help create a climate which is favorable to private investment and initiative through the adoption of suitable tax and customs legislation, the development of an appropriate legal system to furnish a sound and workable framework for business activity, the training of technicians, and by many other methods.

American business has a difficult and important role too. Its representatives must have an understanding of foreign ways and a willingness and ability to adapt to them where necessary. They must also be able to teach and lead and inspire enthusiasm and initiative in the host-country nationals working with them. They can often be our most effective ambassadors because they are in a unique position to eliminate fear and suspicion of private enterprise by making it work in such a way that the people of the host country are manifestly enjoying its benefits.

If all of the partners in this enterprise will do their fair share, and particularly if some of the other prosperous nations of the free world will also make the great contribution of which they

are now increasingly capable, we can confidently expect that private initiative and resourcefulness will become a factor of ever-growing importance in the economic growth of the newly developing areas of the world.

GATT Contracting Parties Conclude 17th Session

Press release 653 dated November 21

Trade matters of fundamental importance to the nations that participate in the work of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) were dealt with at the 17th session of the Contracting Parties which ended November 19, 1960.¹ In line with its overall trade expansion program the United States continued to make full use of the opportunities afforded by the GATT to press for the removal of restrictions on American exports. Among the items considered at the Geneva meeting were the removal of import restrictions, the GATT program for the expansion of trade, the formation of regional markets, the problem of the avoidance of market disruption, and accession by a number of newly independent and other countries.

Removal of Import Restrictions

During the session the United States urged the early removal of restrictions on imports of American products, both in the multilateral forum of the GATT and in informal, bilateral consultations.

The GATT Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions shortly before and during the session conducted consultations with Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, and Pakistan on the quantitative import restrictions each maintains to protect its balance of payments. In the consultations the United States urged the consulting countries to relax their import restrictions as quickly as their balance-of-payments positions permit and, in particular, to eliminate any remaining discrimination against American goods, including that arising from commitments under bilateral arrangements. The committee's annual report on

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Nov. 14, 1960, p. 758.

the discriminatory application of import restrictions noted that, despite conspicuous progress in recent months in eliminating so-called discrimination, many countries continue to discriminate against imports from dollar countries as well as against imports from other sources. In approving the report the Contracting Parties urged the rapid elimination of discrimination.

The Contracting Parties also examined import restrictions maintained by Germany and Belgium. During the session Italy announced that a large number of industrial items and some agricultural products would be liberalized by the end of this month. At the request of the United States arrangements were made for the intersessional examination of remaining restrictions if this should prove necessary within the next several months. The United States also requested multilateral examination of restrictions maintained by France.

Bilateral consultations held between the United States and representatives of France, Greece, Japan, Norway, and Sweden covered specific trade problems in a wide range of industrial and agricultural products. The United States was assured that consideration would be given to easing of the restrictions.

Before the end of the session Uruguay announced that it had eliminated the quantitative import restrictions which had previously been maintained for balance-of-payments reasons.

During the discussion of the general problem of import restrictions the Contracting Parties reaffirmed their view that special efforts should be directed toward the removal of all restrictions not justified under the General Agreement. They also agreed to new procedures for the quick and effective consideration of, and consultation on, any future restrictions which countries might consider necessary to safeguard their foreign exchange reserves.

Program for the Expansion of International Trade

The work of GATT Committees II and III, established at an earlier session to study agricultural protectionism and obstacles to the trade of the less developed countries, was reviewed by the Contracting Parties. Committee II, after consultations with most of the major agricultural exporters, is now assessing the effects of national agricultural policies on world trade in agricul-

tural products. The disadvantages of high levels of protection have already been clearly brought out by the committee's work.

Committee III recognizes the importance of trade to the economic development of less developed countries. The objectives of this GATT program, unique among the efforts of international bodies to deal with the trade problems of the less developed countries, are to enlarge the present markets of these countries and accelerate diversification of their exports. To date the committee has identified obstacles to expansion of trade of the less developed countries and has called on governments to examine urgently the possibilities of eliminating or reducing such obstacles. Many nations noted with concern the little progress made by some industrial countries in this respect. The committee has also considered steps that the less developed countries themselves can take to expand their trade.

Market Integration Projects

As at previous sessions, a spokesman for the European Economic Community (EEC) reported on developments in the Community during the last 6 months. The United States, after reiterating its support for the successful integration of the member states within a liberal trade pattern, stressed the importance of a liberal common agricultural policy in harmony with the GATT objective of expanding international trade. The United States also expressed the hope that commodity problems, particularly those faced by certain less developed countries, would be taken into account by the Community.

While no decision was taken as to the conformity with the GATT of the provisions of the Stockholm Convention, which established the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the belief that the convention as a whole is in harmony with the spirit of the General Agreement was restated by the United States and a number of other countries. The Contracting Parties agreed that there remained certain legal and practical issues which could not be fruitfully discussed further at this stage. The seven-member group (Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom) indicated its readiness to furnish further information as requested by the Contracting Parties.

Careful examination was given to the Treaty of

Montevideo, which will establish the Latin American Free Trade Area, a grouping of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. The review of the treaty in the light of the objectives and provisions of the General Agreement resulted in the adoption by the Contracting Parties of conclusions which should permit the Latin American countries to proceed with the ratification and application of the Montevideo Treaty. The representatives of the South American countries declared the intention of their governments to observe their international commitments, including those under the GATT, and to provide the GATT Contracting Parties with all useful information as the Latin American Free Trade Area develops. The United States expressed the belief that the Latin American Free Trade Area, acting in conformity with GATT provisions and principles, could lead to the expansion of trade and advance the welfare of countries both within and without the proposed free-trade area.

Paris Economic Meetings

Primacy of the GATT in the trade field was re-emphasized by the United States in the discussion of the negotiations in progress in Paris to reconstitute the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).² The new body, in which the United States and Canada also plan to participate, is seen as a means of strengthening international economic cooperation in the broad field of national economic policy and of increasing and improving the flow of development assistance to the less developed countries. Importance was attached to the maintenance of close liaison between the two bodies.

Avoidance of Market Disruption

Discussion of the continued failure of some countries to apply the General Agreement to Japan highlighted consideration of the problem of the avoidance of market disruption. The adverse economic, political, and social repercussions that sharp increases in imports in a narrow range of commodities could have in some importing countries has caused general concern. The pro-

gram laid out by the GATT calls for finding practical ways to facilitate the expansion of trade while avoiding these possible adverse effects. At the spring session of the GATT,³ a working party was established to consider the general problem. This group presented the outline of a program which will enable the secretariats of the GATT and the International Labor Office to study the underlying social and commercial factors. To supervise the study program and assist in the solution of immediate problems the Contracting Parties at the 17th session established a standing Committee on Market Disruption.

New voluntary consultative procedures for bilateral and multilateral examination of these problems were agreed upon as a practical first step toward solution of specific problems. The standing committee will continue to search for a generally acceptable multilateral solution of such problems.

Additional Participation in the GATT

Added to the growing number of countries associated with the work of the GATT were Nigeria, which became a contracting party, and Argentina. The latter acceded provisionally with a view to full accession following tariff negotiations. Ireland, which had indicated its interest in accession, was invited to participate in the 1961 tariff negotiations with a view to accession.

Consideration was given to a provisional regime for 16 former territories, principally in Africa, that have recently acquired autonomy in commercial matters pending their decision whether they desire to be contracting parties.

Acceptance by Poland and two-thirds of the contracting parties of the declaration⁴ governing relations between the GATT and that country was announced during the session. Entry into force of the declaration marks the beginning of a new phase in the relationship between Poland and the GATT which is expected to lead to the expansion of trade opportunities between Poland and GATT participants.

Other Business

A noteworthy accomplishment of the session was the opening for acceptance of a declaration

² For background, see *ibid.*, Feb. 1, 1960, p. 139.

³ *Ibid.*, June 27, 1960, p. 1033.

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Feb. 15, 1960, p. 248.

whereby it is hoped that the major trading nations will renounce the use of export subsidies on manufactured products that tend to disturb normal competition.

A new convention considered by the Contracting Parties is also expected to be opened for signature soon. This is the Convention on Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment, prepared by the Brussels Customs Cooperation Council and reviewed by a group of experts of the Contracting Parties. The convention also applies specifically to television, cinematographic, and professional equipment.

Annual reports coming under review by the Contracting Parties included that submitted by the United States on its controls on certain agricultural imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The relaxation or removal of existing restrictions, particularly on dairy products, as soon as conditions permit, was urged by some countries. In connection with the annual review of the disposal of commodity surpluses the United States reported on its operations under P.L. 480. It was generally agreed that the United States has developed effective safeguards for the commercial interests of other countries and that these disposals have been of benefit to the economies of the less developed countries.

In the first annual review of relations with Yugoslavia, provided for by the declaration⁵ on relations between Yugoslavia and the GATT, the signatories to the declaration welcomed the progress which Yugoslavia has made and the further measures planned in bringing that country's trading system into conformity with the provisions and principles of the General Agreement.

The chairman of the U.S. delegation was Charles W. Adair, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; George H. Becker, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, served as vice chairman and Frank P. Butler, Chief, Commercial Policy and Treaties Division, Department of State, as the assistant chairman. Special advisers to the delegation were J. Allen Overton, Jr., Vice Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission, and Carl D. Corse, U.S. Representative to the GATT Council of Representatives. Other

members of the U.S. delegation were from the Departments of State, Treasury, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor.

Trade Committee Supplements Notice on GATT Negotiations

TAC ANNOUNCEMENT

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements (TAC), with the approval of the President, on November 22 supplemented its notice officially published on May 28, 1960,¹ that the U.S. Government intends to participate, under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, in multilateral tariff negotiations within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The notice of November 22 has attached to it a supplementary list of products² on which the United States may consider offering tariff concessions for the purpose of obtaining from other countries concessions of benefit to U.S. export trade.³

Issuance of the list of products attached to the supplementary notice provides an opportunity for all interested persons to submit any information they may wish on whether or not the U.S. Government should offer concessions on individual products. No decision has been reached regarding the possibility of offering a tariff concession on any article on the list. Such a decision will be made only after there has been an opportunity to appraise all information obtained from the public during the supplementary hearing process now

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of June 13, 1960, p. 968. For the list of products to be considered for U.S. concessions, see Department of State publication 6986, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. (40 cents); for corrections to the list, see BULLETIN of July 4, 1960, p. 22.

² Not printed here. For the supplementary list of products to be considered for possible U.S. concessions, see Department of State publication 7105, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents (15 cents).

³ For a list of products on which the United States may seek concessions from other countries, see Department of State publication 6987, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents (30 cents).

⁵ For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 28, 1959, p. 453.

being started, as well as that otherwise available to the agencies of the Government.

A number of so-called basket categories of products have been included in the list. The extent to which offers of concessions on items included in these basket categories may be made will depend on the information that is developed with regard to the content of the categories. An opportunity will be provided for importers and other interested persons to submit detailed information on specific articles included in those categories.

The negotiations, which are sponsored by the GATT, began in Geneva, Switzerland, in September 1960.⁴ The conference is being held in two phases, with the first being concerned principally with two types of renegotiations and the second with negotiations for an exchange of new concessions. During the second phase of the conference, scheduled to begin in January 1961, a number of the contracting parties, as well as the Commission of the European Economic Community, expect to negotiate with each other for an exchange of new concessions. Several countries will also be negotiating for the purpose of acceding to the GATT. The negotiations in this phase will have as their aim the reduction of tariffs and other charges on imports through the exchange of reciprocal and mutually advantageous tariff concessions.

In addition to the countries named in the May announcement the United States may negotiate with Argentina, Cambodia, Ireland, Libya, and Portugal, all of which will be negotiating for accession to the GATT, and with Turkey, which is a contracting party.

U.S. participation in the negotiations will be under the authority delegated to the President in the Trade Agreements Act, which was most recently extended and amended by Public Law 686, 85th Congress, in 1958. No concession can be made in excess of that authority. Under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements within the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962. In such trade agreements the President is authorized to reduce U.S. duties in stages by any one of three alternative methods as follows:

1. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958,

⁴ For text of a statement made at the opening session on Sept. 1 by Clarence Randall, Special Assistant to the President, see BULLETIN of Sept. 19, 1960, p. 453.

by not more than 20 percent, provided that no more than a 10 percent reduction may be made effective in any one year.

2. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958, by not more than 2 percentage points ad valorem (or its ad valorem equivalent, in the case of a specific rate or a combination of ad valorem and specific rates). The reduction in any one year under this alternative may not exceed 1 percentage point.

3. Reducing to 50 percent ad valorem or its equivalent a rate which is in excess of that level, provided that not more than one-third of the total reduction may become effective in any one year.

The issuance of the supplementary notice of intention to negotiate and the supplementary list of products which may be considered in such negotiations, together with related notices issued by the Committee for Reciprocity Information (CRI) and the U.S. Tariff Commission, sets in motion the usual domestic procedures for obtaining full information in preparation for negotiations. The related notices concern (a) CRI arrangements for the submission of oral and written views on the forthcoming negotiations, and (b) the Tariff Commission's arrangements for public hearings in connection with its peril-point investigation of the extent to which concessions on listed products in the U.S. tariff may be made without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The United States will grant no concession on any product not included in the list published May 28, 1960, this supplementary list, or a subsequent published list. Appearance of a product on the public list is exclusively for the purpose of affording interested persons an opportunity to present their views on the possibility of a concession; it does not carry with it the implication that a concession will in fact be offered or made on the product.

Domestic producers, importers, and other interested persons are invited to present their views as to whether concessions should or should not be made on products on the published import list together with all possible pertinent information about such products. Submissions may also be presented to assist in compliance with the policy

reco
Con
ance
ers
exp
plie
full
proc
be m
De
appl
Unit
tain
proc
lease
open
prese
made
busin
be he
ment
Dece
sion
is Ja
hear
and
indic
Th
that
uary
vestig
Trad
amen
on lis
witho
dome
petiti
Tariff
Comm
Vie
Comm
be m
procit
terdep
and th
intere
menta
Tariff
wish—

recommended in the President's message to the Congress of March 30, 1954,⁵ relating to avoidance of concessions on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country which is the principal supplier. All views and information will be carefully considered in arriving at a decision on each product as to whether or not a concession should be made by the United States.

Details concerning the submission of briefs and applications to be heard on concessions which the United States might either grant or obtain are contained in the notice of the Committee for Reciprocity Information which is attached to this release. The hearings before the Committee will open on January 5, 1961. Applications for oral presentation of views and information should be made to the Committee not later than the close of business December 27, 1960. Persons desiring to be heard should also submit written briefs or statements to the Committee by the close of business December 27, 1960. The closing date for submission of briefs by persons not desiring to be heard is January 5, 1961. Only those persons will be heard who presented written briefs or statements and filed applications to be heard by the date indicated.

The U.S. Tariff Commission also announced that it would hold public hearings beginning January 5, 1961, in connection with its peril-point investigation, as required by section 3(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, on the extent to which U.S. concessions on listed products may be made in the negotiations without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. Copies of the notice of the Tariff Commission may be obtained from the Commission.

Views and information received by the Tariff Commission in its hearings referred to above will be made available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information for consideration by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements and the Trade Policy Committee. Persons whose interests relate to products included in the supplementary list, and who have appeared before the Tariff Commission, need not—but may if they wish—appear also before the Committee for Rec-

iprocity Information, if they apply in accordance with the procedures of that Committee, as outlined here.

Persons desiring to suggest items, either import or export, additional to those in the lists for consideration in the negotiations should present their views to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. As mentioned above, if any additional items are considered for the granting of concessions by the United States, they will be the subject of a further public notice and no concession will be made without such notice.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO NEGOTIATE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON TRADE AGREEMENTS
Supplementary Notice Relating to Trade Agreement Negotiations with Governments which are Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and with Certain Other Governments Proposed in the Notice Published May 28, 1960

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 945, ch. 474; 65 Stat. 73, ch. 141), and to paragraph 4 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, as amended (3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp. pp. 281, 355), notice was published on May 28, 1960 by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements of proposed trade agreement negotiations with foreign governments which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and with the Governments of Israel, Spain, Switzerland and Tunisia (25 F.R. 4764). Annexed to such notice was a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties or other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment in the announced trade agreement negotiations (25 F.R. 4756-79), which list was later corrected in certain particulars (25 F.R. 5197).

Further notice is hereby given, supplementary to the original notice, that the foregoing trade agreement negotiations will include possible negotiations also with the Governments of Ireland, Libya, Cambodia, Argentina and Portugal, or with instrumentalities thereof, and including in each case areas in respect of which such governments or instrumentalities thereof have authority to conduct trade agreement negotiations. There is annexed hereto a list, supplementary to the original list, as corrected, of additional articles imported into the United States to be considered in the proposed trade agreement negotiations for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment.

The additional articles proposed for consideration in the negotiations are identified in the annexed list by specifying the numbers of the paragraphs in the tariff sched-

⁵ For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 19, 1954, p. 602.

ules of Title I and Title II of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in which they are provided for together with the language used in such tariff paragraphs to provide for such articles, except that where necessary the statutory language has been modified by the omission of words or the addition of new language in order to narrow the scope of the original language. Where no qualifying language is used with regard to the type, grade, value, et cetera, of any listed article, all types, grades, values, et cetera, of the article covered by the language used are included. In case of any listed article that is subject to an import tax under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, the tax on such article will be considered for possible modification or binding against increase. In the case of each article in the list with respect to which the corresponding product of Cuba is now entitled to preferential treatment, the negotiations referred to will involve the elimination, reduction, or continuation of the preference, perhaps in some cases with an adjustment or specification of the rate applicable to the product of Cuba.

No article will be considered in the negotiations for possible modification of duties or other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment unless it is included, specifically or by reference, in the list annexed to the notice by the Committee published May 28, 1960, as corrected, or in the list annexed hereto, or unless it is subsequently included in a further supplementary public list (or in a prior list in the case of a continued negotiation of compensatory adjustments). Except where otherwise indicated in the next sentence of this notice or in the list itself, only duties imposed under the paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930 specified in the list with regard to articles described therein and import taxes, if any, imposed on such articles under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, will be considered for a possible decrease, but additional or separate duties or taxes on such articles imposed under any other provisions of law may be bound against increase as an assurance that the concession under the listed paragraph or section will not be nullified. In addition, any action which might be taken with respect to basic duties on products may involve action with respect to compensatory duties imposed on manufactures containing such products.

In the event that an article which as of February 1, 1960, was regarded as classifiable under a description included in the list is excluded therefrom by judicial decision or otherwise prior to the conclusion of the trade agreement negotiations, the list will nevertheless be considered as including such article.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended, and paragraph 5 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, as amended, information and views as to any aspect of the proposals, including the list of articles, announced in this supplementary notice may be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by that Committee. Persons interested in export articles may wish to express their views regarding any tariff or other trade concessions that might be requested of foreign gov-

ernments, or instrumentalities thereof, with which negotiations are to be conducted. Any other matters appropriate to be considered in connection with the negotiations proposed above may also be presented.

Public hearings in connection with the "peril point" investigation of the United States Tariff Commission in connection with the articles included in the annexed list, pursuant to section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, are the subject of an announcement of this date issued by that Commission.

By direction of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements this 22nd day of November 1960.

JOHN A. BIRCH,
Chairman
Interdepartmental Committee
on Trade Agreements

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Supplementary Notice of Trade-Agreement Negotiations proposed in the Notice of May 28, 1960.

Submission of Information to the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Closing date for applications to be heard December 27, 1960.

Closing date for submission of briefs by those desiring to be heard December 27, 1960.

Closing date for submission of briefs by those not desiring to be heard January 5, 1961.

Public hearings open January 5, 1961.

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements has issued on this day a notice supplementing the notice published May 28, 1960 (25 F.R. 4764), as corrected (25 F.R. 5197), of intention to conduct trade agreement negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with foreign governments which are contracting parties to that agreement and with certain other Governments.

Annexed to the supplementary notice of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements is a list of additional articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible concessions in the negotiations; this list supplements the list annexed to the notice by that committee published May 28, 1960 (25 F.R. 4764-79), as corrected (25 F.R. 5197).

Pursuant to paragraph 5 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, as amended (3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp. pp. 281, 355), the Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that all applications for oral presentation of views in regard to any aspect of the proposals announced in this supplementary notice shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than December 27, 1960. The application must indicate the import article or articles on which the applicant desires to be heard and an estimate of the time required for oral presentation. All persons who make application to be heard shall also submit to the Committee their views in writing in regard to the foregoing proposals not later than

December 27, 1960. Written statements of persons not desiring to be heard shall be submitted not later than January 5, 1961. Such communications shall be addressed to "Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D.C." Fifteen copies of written statements, either typed, printed, or duplicated, shall be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to.

Written statements submitted to the Committee, except information and business data proffered in confidence, shall be open to inspection by interested persons. Information and business data proffered in confidence shall be submitted on separate pages clearly marked "For Official Use Only of the Committee for Reciprocity Information".

Public hearings will be held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at which oral statements will be heard, beginning at 2:00 P.M. on January 5, 1961, in the Hearing Room in the Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. Witnesses who make application to be heard will be advised regarding the time and place of their individual appearances. Appearances at hearings before the Committee may be made only by or on behalf of those persons who have filed written statements and who have within the time prescribed made written application for oral presentation of views. Statements made at the public hearings shall be under oath.

Persons or groups interested in import articles may present to the Committee their views concerning possible tariff concessions by the United States on any article, whether or not included in the list annexed to the supplementary notice, but not including any article provided for in the list published May 28, 1960, as corrected. No tariff reduction or specific continuance of customs or excise treatment will be considered on any article which is not included in the list annexed to the aforesaid public notice by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, the list annexed to the supplementary notice on this date, or in a further supplementary list (or in a prior list in the case of a continued negotiation of compensatory adjustments). Any other matters appropriate to be considered in connection with the proposed negotiations may also be presented.

The United States Tariff Commission has today announced public hearings on the import items appearing in the list annexed to the supplementary notice to run concurrently with the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Oral testimony and written information submitted to the Tariff Commission will be made available to and will be considered by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Consequently, interested persons may present oral testimony with regard to import articles included in the foregoing list at the Tariff Commission hearings only, but they may, if they wish, appear also before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, if they have previously made written application to appear and have filed a written brief with the Committee in accordance with the terms of this notice.

Copies of the list of import articles attached to the supplementary notice being issued by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements may be obtained from the Committee for Reciprocity Information at the address

designated above and may be inspected at the field offices of the Department of Commerce.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 22nd day of November 1960.

EDWARD YARDLEY

Secretary,

Committee for Reciprocity Information

United States To Assist Turkey in Financing Imports

Press release 657 dated November 25

The Department of State announced on November 25 that the U.S. Government has made available \$12 million in mutual security funds to assist Turkey in financing imports during the current fiscal year.

This release brings to \$46,400,000 the amount the International Cooperation Administration has made available from MSP defense support funds so far during the current fiscal year to aid Turkey in maintaining its import program.

The \$12 million will be used in Turkey to finance the following imports during the quarterly import-quota period ending December 31: chemicals, \$1,960,000; tires and tubes, \$1,500,000; industrial machinery, \$1,000,000; vehicle parts, \$1,100,000; lubricants, \$2,250,000; pulp and paper, \$575,000; nonferrous metals, \$399,600; aluminum and products, \$125,000; pumping equipment, \$85,600; bearings, \$100,000; motor vehicles, \$672,000; off-road trucks, \$120,000; tractors, \$270,000; rubber and products, \$800,000; small trucks, \$500,000; cattle hides, \$380,000; hides and skins, \$73,800; calf-skins, \$89,000.

President Concurs in Tariff Findings on Lead and Zinc Import Quota

White House press release dated November 25

The President has concurred with the U.S. Tariff Commission's recent finding that no formal investigation should be instituted at this time to determine whether limitations on lead and zinc imports should be relaxed. The President found with the Tariff Commission that there is not sufficient reason at this time to reopen the escape-clause action which resulted 2 years ago in a quota

on imports of lead and zinc.¹ The President's decision means that the import quota established in October 1958 as the result of escape-clause action will continue to apply.

The President's action was taken after consultation with the Trade Policy Committee. The Tariff Commission's study was made pursuant to Executive Order 10401, which requires periodic review of affirmative actions taken under the escape clause. This was the Tariff Commission's first such review of the 1958 lead and zinc quota. The Commission's report was submitted to the President on September 30, 1960.

U.S., France Exchange Ratifications of Convention of Establishment

Press release 652 dated November 21

The instruments of ratification of the Convention of Establishment between the United States and France² were exchanged on November 21. The exchange was made by the Secretary of State and the French Ambassador, Hervé Alphand. This action completes the formal procedures connected with bringing the convention into force. By its terms it will become effective on December 21, 1960, 1 month after the exchange of ratifications.

The convention was signed at Paris on November 25, 1959. It was approved by the General Assembly and Senate of France on June 23 and July 21, 1960, respectively, and by the U.S. Senate on August 17, 1960. It was ratified by President Eisenhower on August 29, 1960.

The convention is similar to the treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation that the United States has concluded with a number of countries in recent years, as concerns provisions dealing with business activities, with investments, and with personal and property rights of nationals of one country within the territories of the other. Unlike most of these treaties it does not contain provisions dealing with imports and exports or with navigation. It is the first comprehensive treaty of its type that has been concluded between the United States and France. It may be compared in some respects, however,

with the highly significant Franco-American Treaty of Amity and Commerce of 1778, this country's first treaty.

The new convention consists of 18 articles, a protocol, and accompanying joint declaration. Its clauses contain assurances on numerous subjects relating to the establishment of persons and enterprises. In brief each country engages (1) to accord within its territories to citizens and corporations of the other treatment no less favorable than it accords to its own citizens with respect to engaging in a wide range of commercial, industrial, and financial activities; (2) to apply high standards for the safeguarding of persons, their properties, and interests; and (3) generally to take appropriate action in furtherance of international investment. It is therefore expected that the entry into force of the convention, while bringing further proof of the cordial relations between the United States and France, will stimulate the development of exchanges, commercial or otherwise, between the two countries.

Department and U.S. Medical Agencies Discuss Training of Foreign Doctors

Press release 647 dated November 18

At the request of Dr. John P. Hubbard, Executive Secretary of the National Board of Medical Examiners, officers of the Department of State on November 18 met with him and representatives of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG), the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, and the American Hospital Association to discuss matters related to the giving of the ECFMG examination abroad and other problems related to the training of foreign medical graduates.

The Department of State has received numerous expressions of concern over the foreign relations effect of failure by foreign doctors to pass the examination required by the ECFMG, a private organization sponsored by the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the Association of Medical Colleges, and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States. While noting that a majority of the foreign medical graduates taking the examination were successful, the Department expressed

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 13, 1958, p. 579.

² For text, see BULLETIN of Dec. 7, 1959, p. 829.

to the medical agencies most directly involved its concern over the impact on foreign relations of the possible sudden release of a number of foreign doctors and urged that steps be taken to ease this situation insofar as practicable.

The medical organizations informed the Department on November 18 that they share this concern and that there are certain ameliorative steps that can be taken, steps which will at the same time protect the interests of the hospitalized public. Details will shortly be forthcoming from the American Medical Association.

For several decades the Department has conducted international educational exchange programs designed to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and those of other countries. It has always been the policy of the Department to facilitate exchange programs under private auspices serving this objective.

Congress, in 1948, authorized the Department to make regulations governing the entry of foreign nationals for educational purposes. It is under this authority that the Department has permitted American hospitals and related institutions to sponsor exchange-visitor programs providing training for foreign doctors. The Department does not, however, intervene in the selection of the participants in these programs nor in any way supervise their training. This is the responsibility of the sponsoring institution.

The Department has designated as sponsors of private exchange-visitor programs for the training of interns and residents only those hospitals and institutions which offer training facilities of a sufficiently high standard to gain the approval of the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. The Department has also been aware that medical groups recognize that foreign physicians undergoing such training and charged with patient care must possess language and professional qualifications sufficient to assure that they could assume such responsibilities successfully and without prejudice to the well-being of patients entrusted to their care.

The American Medical Association's Council on

Medical Education and Hospitals nearly 3 years ago announced plans for giving an examination such as that administered by the ECFMG. Subsequently, the hospitals and institutions concerned, as well as the foreign doctors involved, were given notice that the examination was to be instituted and that hospitals and institutions wishing to enjoy continued approval of their training programs by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association could thereafter include on their staffs only those foreign doctors who have passed the examination.

Since these interns and residents from abroad who are participants in exchange-visitor programs were admitted to the United States expressly to undergo training in the sponsoring hospital, termination of that connection for any reason, including failure to pass the ECFMG examination, involves also termination of the individual's visa status as an exchange visitor unless he can transfer to some other exchange-visitor program. Termination of this status, with the resultant possibility that the exchange visitor will have to leave the United States, does not limit him to returning to the country from which he initially entered the United States. He may travel to any country which is willing to admit him.

Interns and residents in the United States on immigration visas who fail to pass the ECFMG examination are not subject to termination of their status merely by virtue of their failure to pass the examination.

The Department of State is, of course, cognizant of the difficulties which might follow from release by hospitals of those foreign participants who fail the examination, but it is also concerned about the establishment and maintenance of acceptable standards of patient care owing to its responsibilities in the designation of exchange-visitor programs of qualified hospitals. The filling of full staffing positions in American hospitals is, of course, not a primary purpose of the exchange-visitor program, which envisages that the persons taking training here would normally return to their homelands to use the skills they have gained to benefit their countrymen and to foster good will for the United States abroad.

U.N. General Assembly Accepts Credentials of Congolese President Kasavubu

Following are statements made by James W. Barco, Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and James J. Wadsworth, U.S. Representative, during debate on the question of the representation of the Republic of the Congo in the United Nations.

STATEMENT BY MR. BARCO:

I would like to begin by making one or two brief remarks really as my right of reply to the Soviet representative before I speak to the subject now before the committee. I shall be very brief because I do not wish to impose on this group a controversy between me and Mr. [Valerian A.] Zorin, but I would remind the committee that, if there has been any controversy here between us, it was begun by the representative of the Soviet Union.

He asked this question at one point in his remarks: Why had the United States directed its remarks to the Soviet Union? He has tried from the outset, beginning yesterday morning, to make this whole question an attack on the United States. I leave it to you to decide why Mr. Zorin wants this question to be an attack on the United States, why he wants to use it as such, and what he wants to accomplish from it. He has referred to the United States as having engaged in a political maneuver, an "obvious political maneuver" to call the committee, and to the "machinations" of the United States in this regard. I wish simply to recall to this committee the record of the United States on the question of the Congo and the record of the Soviet Union on this subject. I think they speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the United States believes that

the time has come for the Credentials Committee and for the General Assembly to take action to seat the representatives of the Republic of the Congo, whose capital is at Léopoldville. We believe that now is the most appropriate time for several reasons.

First, one of the most important issues with which this General Assembly has been dealing is the situation in the Congo.² We have not completed that consideration. The problems which will be confronted by the General Assembly and debated by the General Assembly in plenary session have a quite full history in the United Nations, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly itself. They are primarily of concern to the people and to the Republic of the Congo. Productive results from any further United Nations discussions on this issue require the participation of representatives of that member state. Recommendations or decisions which we may take without the views of the responsible head of that state being heard could easily be futile and, indeed, harmful. Surely it is essential that the Republic of the Congo be represented if we are to avoid the charge that the United Nations takes important decisions relating to the Congo without consulting its spokesmen.

Another reason is that we have at United Nations headquarters the one representative of the Congo whose credentials have not been and, in fact, cannot be challenged by anyone. The General Assembly heard President [Joseph] Kasavubu at the 912th plenary meeting, and there was no objection from any quarter to hearing him. He was recognized at that time by the General Assembly as the President of the Republic. He spoke as the uncontested Chief of State. He asked

¹ Made in the Credentials Committee on Nov. 10 (U.S. delegation press release 3570).

² For background, see BULLETIN of Oct. 10, 1960, p. 583.

us to approve his credentials without delay. There was no objection. We are governed in our consideration of credentials by rule 27 of our rules of procedure, which specify that credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be issued either by the head of state or government or by the minister for foreign affairs. The appropriate credentials issued, in this case, by the Head of State of the Republic of the Congo are before this committee. The Head of State himself will head the delegation. We would indeed be remiss in our duties if we were to fail now to recommend the acceptance of these credentials.

Thirdly, considerable time has elapsed between the admission of the Congo to full United Nations membership on September 20, 1960, and the seating of its delegation. To procrastinate further might give the impression that some members of our Organization do not consider the Republic of the Congo a full-fledged member but some kind of ward to be kept waiting in the wings indefinitely without ever having a chance to be heard.

Position of Congolese Chief of State Uncontested

Mr. Chairman, it is not likely that the next few days or the next few weeks will serve to dispel totally the differences of opinion as to which government is the legal government of the Congo. On the other hand, the position of the Chief of State of that Republic is uncontested. In the progress report³ submitted by the Secretary-General's special representative in the Congo, the need for a fresh start toward the solution of the Congo's problems is clearly set forth. This is one way to do it and do it helpfully. I need only draw this committee's attention to the conclusion of that report, wherein the office of the Chief of State and the Parliament are described as the two institutions whose foundations still stand and on whom solutions and through whom solutions must be sought. Any attempt now to deny the right of the Chief of State to represent his own people in this world forum could undermine seriously what Ambassador Dayal⁴ describes as one of the two

³For text of the first progress report, see U.N. doc. S/4531; for text of the second progress report, see U.N. doc. S/4557 and Corr. 1.

⁴Rajeshwar Dayal, special representative of the Secretary-General in the Congo.

remaining foundations, the Presidency of the Republic—a vital foundation for further progress in the Congo. Nothing is to be gained by further delay, and in fact damage would be caused by further delay. We believe this question should now be put to the vote so that it may be decided in accordance with normal democratic rules and procedures.

Now I wish to read from the verbatim record of the General Assembly meeting of 8 November at 3 p.m., contained in A/PV/912, a statement by the representative of the Soviet Union on this very point:

In this connexion, the tabling of the eight-power draft resolution in document A/L.319/Rev.2 to a certain degree sets out the guide-lines which, if followed by the General Assembly, would enable the Assembly at last to contribute constructively to the solution of the Congo problem. In this draft resolution the question is specifically raised of immediately seating the legitimate representatives of the Government of the Congo at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. This is a reasonable and just demand. After all, we cannot in good conscience be reconciled with a situation where, owing to the intrigues of the colonialists the representatives of the Republic of the Congo alone among the independent African states recently admitted to the United Nations are being denied the possibility of taking part in the deliberations of the General Assembly. It would seem that precisely the representatives of this country should be the ones to be invited to this session, before all others, so they might report to us personally on the needs of the Congolese people, report to us their assessment of the political and economic situation in that country.

That is a statement by the representative of the Soviet Union who is sitting here today. It is exactly the point. The only difference is that at this meeting the Soviet representative has taken a quite different stand. Why? Now, who is better able to do what Mr. Zorin refers to here in representing the needs of the Congolese people than the President of the Congo himself?

U.S. Interest in Well-Being of the Congo

I should like to make one more remark concerning what the representative of the Soviet Union has said about the United States. He said earlier that we seem to have some special interest in the Congo. I would point out to Mr. Zorin that we do have an interest in the Congo and we have demonstrated that from the beginning of this problem in the United Nations. Our interest is

in the well-being, the security, the integrity, the independence, the independence from outside influence of the Congo. We have sought in every way possible to support the United Nations effort to these ends, while the Soviet Union has sought in every possible way to destroy that effort. The record is perfectly clear. Mr. Zorin cannot deny it.

Now, I do not have to go on with that because I think everyone who has followed the debate on the Congo knows it very well. If they have not followed the debate, the records are here. They can be shown. They can be read. They can be considered, and the conclusion is quite clear.

There have been great demands on the United States. The United States has willingly met them at the behest of the United Nations and of the Congo. That is our interest.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude—and I hope, indeed, that we can conclude the limited task which is before this committee promptly without further efforts to avoid this question—the United States makes the following proposal and proposes that this committee adopt the following draft resolution:⁵

The Credentials Committee recommends that the General Assembly accept the credentials of the representatives of the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville) issued by the Head of the State and communicated by him to the President of the General Assembly in a letter dated November 8, 1960.

If there is any question as to what letter I am referring to, it is on the very front of document A/CR/L.3 [Rev. 1] dated 10 November 1960. It is the letter, as paragraph 1, signed by the President of the Republic of the Congo and countersigned by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, that we adopt the resolution which I have read out as the most helpful thing that this committee can do. To do otherwise would be to step backward. I suggest that we proceed as promptly as possible, without any inhibitions on people expressing their views, but as promptly as possible to a vote on this resolution.⁶

⁵ U.N. doc. A/CR/L.4.

⁶ The resolution was adopted by the Credentials Committee on Nov. 10 by a vote of 6 to 1 (U.S.S.R.), with Morocco and the U.A.R. not participating.

FIRST STATEMENT BY MR. WADSWORTH⁷

I have asked for the floor in order to indicate my delegation's opposition to this particular motion⁸ and to explain the reasons why we oppose it.

I think that we must regain some perspective in this matter and realize that the situation in the Congo also has an item as a matter of record before it here in this Assembly and that the question of credentials is not the same as the question of the situation in the Congo.

The United States deeply regrets the resort to force, the loss of life, and the injuries incurred yesterday in the Congo. This incident is a regrettable culmination of the attempts of the Congolese authorities to have certain Ghanaian officials leave the Congo. As early as October 5 last, President Kasavubu in a letter to the President of Ghana requested the Ghanaian Government to recall Mr. Nathaniel Welbeck, the personal representative of the President, on the ground that he was intervening in the internal affairs of the Congo. This request was made again just a few days ago and included a request that certain other Ghanaian officials leave the Congo on the ground that they had also intervened in the internal affairs of the Congo.

We hope, therefore, that the Assembly will continue its work and will soon approve the credentials of the Chief of State and his delegation so that he may return to the Congo at a reasonably early date and get on with the task of bringing calm and peace to his nation, in cooperation with the United Nations.

As I said before, Mr. President, the United States deeply regrets the loss of life of soldiers of the United Nations Command—soldiers from Tunisia—and we ask Ambassador [Mongi] Slim [Tunisian representative] to extend our sympathy to his Government. There are few members of the United Nations who have made such substantial contributions to this Organization as has Tunisia, both in the Congo and elsewhere, and they merit deep respect for it. We also extend our sympathy to the Republic of the Congo for the loss of lives of Congolese soldiers who were

⁷ Made in plenary session on Nov. 22 (U.S. delegation press release 3581).

⁸ A Ghanaian proposal for adjournment of the debate on Congolese credentials was defeated on Nov. 22.

acting to enforce a legitimate expulsion order of the Chief of State. We ask President Kasavubu to accept these regrets on behalf of the United States.

We also take favorable note, as I think we all should, of the fact that President Kasavubu has himself already sent messages of regret to the Secretary-General and to Tunisia.

But the incident appears to be over. It is an incident which does not affect the precise issue which is before us today. In fact, it emphasizes, if anything, the necessity of our completing action on the seating of this delegation as soon as possible and getting on with our regular business. Therefore we are opposed to the motion to adjourn debate and hope that the Assembly will reject it.

We deeply regret the failure of the Ghanaian Government to respond affirmatively and in accordance with normal practice to this request of the Congolese authorities. If they had done so, this regrettable resort to force would never have taken place. Now that Mr. Welbeck has, according to reports, left the Congo, I believe that this matter and this incident can be considered closed.

Now we hope that calm can be maintained and no further incident of this character will occur in the future. This unhappy incident is a cogent reminder of the need for every feasible step to be taken as soon as possible to get on with the job of strengthening the two basic institutions of the Congo, namely, the Chief of State and the Parliament.

SECOND STATEMENT BY MR. WADSWORTH *

Before this debate started several days ago, I had planned to make very brief remarks limited strictly to the issue precisely before us, which is the report of the Credentials Committee.¹⁰ I still intend to do so as much as possible. I cannot help but observe, however, that other speakers have ranged wide in their remarks into the internal affairs of the Congo and into extensive attacks upon other states, including my own. It will therefore be necessary for me to deal with some of these remarks, and I am sure that I will receive

* Made in plenary session on Nov. 22 (U.S. delegation press release 3582).

¹⁰ U.N. doc. A/4578.

the same generous latitude that others have received.

In passing, I wish to pay tribute to the courage and pertinacity of the Foreign Minister of Cameroun [Charles Okala], who, I believe, was well within his rights and well within accuracy in complaining that he had been gavelled down where others had not.

Now, on November 8 the Chief of State of the Congo, President Kasavubu, arrived in New York to address the General Assembly. He asked that the Credentials Committee and the Assembly meet promptly to approve his credentials and those of his delegation so that the Congo could fill the seat which belongs to it by virtue of its membership in this Organization. Two days later the Credentials Committee, by a vote of 6 to 1, with two delegations not participating, approved those credentials. The United States supported the seating of President Kasavubu and his delegation in the Credentials Committee and supports it here. We do so for straightforward and simple reasons.

Reasons for Seating of President Kasavubu

First, President Kasavubu is the Chief of State of the Republic of the Congo. He was received by the General Assembly as such without any objection from anyone. And whatever else may be said of the Congo and the situation there, the fact that President Kasavubu is the Chief of State is uncontested, as the recent report of the Secretary-General's representative points out.

Second, rule 27 of the rules of procedure provides that "credentials shall be issued either by the Head of the State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs." Now, the credentials before us were issued by President Kasavubu, and there is no doubt that they were properly issued. On the grounds of proper procedure, then, President Kasavubu and his delegation should be seated.

Third, the Congo has been a member of the United Nations for over 2 months. It is not a ward of the United Nations. It is not a colony. It is not a trust territory. It is a sovereign state. And when President Kasavubu arrived in New York efforts were being made to hold a debate on the situation in the Congo without the voice of the Congo being heard. In the view of my delegation it is high time that this be corrected.

Fourth, we consider the objection that the seat-

ing of a delegation appointed by the President of the Congo might prejudice unsolved political or constitutional questions in the Congo to be totally wrong. Here we agree thoroughly with the dangers inherent in delaying this action which were so well expressed by the distinguished representative of Cameroun. Any U.N. body which may plan to go to the Congo—and I might say that the Assembly has as yet no official information of such a trip—must expect to deal with President Kasavubu as Chief of State when it gets there. Certainly no U.N. body could intend to unseat the President or disturb his constitutional powers or diminish the nationwide acceptance of the office he holds. But if the U.N. expects to deal with President Kasavubu as Chief of State in his own country, then the United Nations must also be prepared to deal with him in the same capacity here by giving his legitimate request a positive response.

Now, in our view the seating of the delegation headed by the Chief of State now could not in any way hinder the success of any United Nations mission. In fact, the failure of the Assembly to act now would be much more likely to do so.

Now, those are our views. We think they are right, and we hope the Assembly will show by its vote that the United Nations believes the same.

Mr. President, because we have taken this position, the United States has been calumniated over the past few days by quite a number of speakers. This is not the first time that the United States has been subjected to such vilification, nor, I suppose, will it be the last. But such has never frightened nor deterred us, nor will it do so now.

To begin with, we have little sympathy for the origin of some of this opposition. Those who today are among the most vigorous opponents of the United Nations' taking any action to seat a Congolese delegation were only last week cosponsors of a resolution designed to seat another delegation, that of Mr. [Patrice] Lumumba. And only when Mr. Kasavubu arrived and the Credentials Committee had been called into session did they become the advocates of postponement.

Then it is also notorious that among this group of states there are several who have been openly interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo on behalf of one of the parties to the internal dispute. Reactions of the Republic of the Congo to this interference demonstrate its depth. It has

also been cited in our debate by others, and I don't need to dwell on that.

Above and beyond all this, however, is the thesis drawn by the representative of the U.S.S.R., and lengthily reiterated by all the satellites, that the whole history of the Congo is a history of the evil genius of the United States, employed to keep the Congo under colonial domination, and that the United States had been responsible for every unfortunate development in the Congo since it became independent. Now, this is such a monstrous fabrication coming from a country which unleashed the Korean war and crushed the struggle of the Hungarian people for their liberation from Soviet rule that it hardly seems necessary to deny it. The record of the United States of America in supporting the aims and principles of the United Nations is second to that of no one. This was true in Korea in 1950-51. It was true in Hungary, and in Suez in 1956. And it is true of the Congo in 1960.

Perhaps the delegates have forgotten that the first request of the Congo for outside military assistance came direct to the United States, not to the United Nations. We promptly replied that the Congo should ask the United Nations and not the United States for help. We did this because we did not want the cold war projected into the center of Africa. And had the United States really had the intentions that the U.S.S.R. ascribes to us, we would have done otherwise. And the Congo did turn to the United Nations. It asked the Security Council for aid. We supported this request promptly and vigorously, and we did so later, both in the Council and in the Assembly. As a result of the decisions of the Security Council, the United Nations Force in the Congo was born on paper and it then had to be brought to life. Many countries responded with troops. The United States responded with the indispensable airlift without which the United Nations action could not have taken place.

There are now over 18,000 United Nations troops in the Congo. Over 15,000 of these were taken there by the United States. This 15,000 included troops from Mali, Morocco, Guinea, Ghana, and the United Arab Republic. To do this, the United States assembled a fleet of military transport planes from three continents, placing assistance requested by the United Nations at the top priority of our air-fleet use.

At the same time the United States has not sent a single soldier or a single piece of military equipment nor undertaken any military or even vaguely military steps at all in connection with the Congo except under the direct request of the United Nations.

We are, furthermore, one of the very few countries of the world which have yet made any contribution to the tremendous expenses which the United Nations is incurring to help preserve the sovereignty and integrity of the Congo.

Interference by the U.S.S.R.

In all these ways, Mr. President and fellow delegates, we have shown our respect and support of the United Nations effort in the Congo, and we shall continue to do so. Yet the activities of the U.S.S.R., which has sought to blacken our name, have been directed in an entirely contrary direction. It is they who have sought to destroy the United Nations effort. Although originally professing to support United Nations action in the Congo, the U.S.S.R. promptly started to intervene unilaterally. It sent planes, trucks, equipment, and supplies for military uses into the Congo without the knowledge and without the approval of the United Nations. It actively took sides in internal disputes and gave material support to one of the parties. It continued this interference until first the Security Council and then the General Assembly had to be called into session to stop it. Nor did it stop there. It has engaged in brutal verbal attacks on the United Nations Command. It has sought to defame and destroy the office of the Secretary-General, all because the United Nations has sought to protect the Congo from outside interference. It now continues its massive efforts to cripple United Nations action in the Congo through a categorical refusal to contribute any funds for its support. This, the nation which is attacking the United States, is truly the nation which is trying to rule or ruin the United Nations action in the Congo.

Mr. President, the United States wants to see the Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville) establish itself successfully as a peaceful and united nation. We want to see the United Nations succeed in its effort to help bring that about. Failure is unthinkable. We will continue to support the adoption and implementation of the United Nations policies which will assure this. One such

action, we are convinced, is for this Assembly to give its firm backing to one of the two recognized solid foundations in the Congo, the Chief of State, by seating him and his delegation. The time to act on this is now.¹¹

NATO Research Fellowship Program Announced for 1961-62

Press release 654 dated November 23

A limited number of advanced research fellowships is offered by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for 1961-62 to candidates from member states (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States). A candidate must be a national of a member state and must undertake his research in one or more member countries. Since NATO in its cultural program is especially concerned with strengthening transatlantic relationships, in general preference will be given to U.S. candidates planning to work in one or more European NATO countries.

The aim of the program is "to promote study and research leading to publication on various aspects of the common interests, traditions, and outlook of the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, in order to throw light on the history, present status, and future development of the concept of the Atlantic Community, and of the problems which confront it."

Grants are intended for scholars of established reputation. Candidates will be selected on the basis of their special aptitude for and experience in carrying through a major project of research. In making selections such factors as academic qualifications (generally, the doctoral degree or its equivalent), professional experience, and publications will be taken into account. Awards will be limited to fellows working on projects of direct interest to NATO or to the Atlantic Community as a whole. Projects should pertain to historical, political, economic, and social problems rather than to scientific questions. (Information on the NATO Science Fellowship Program may be ob-

¹¹ On Nov. 22 the Assembly adopted the recommendation of the Credentials Committee by a vote of 53 to 24, with 19 abstentions.

tained from the Fellowship Office, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.) Preliminary screening of American candidates will be by the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, which will recommend candidates to the Department of State and the President's Board of Foreign Scholarships. The Board in turn will nominate a small panel of scholars for consideration, along with similar panels from the above-named countries, by the NATO Selection Committee in Paris. The awards will be made from this total list of candidates from all the member countries. Final selection of candidates will be announced by the Paris committee April 4, 1961. It is expected that only one or two grants will be available to candidates from the United States.

The amount of each advanced research award will be 2,300 new French francs per month (or the equivalent in the currency of any other member state in which the research project is undertaken). Grants will normally be for a period of 2 to 4 months but may, in special cases, be extended to 6 months. NATO will pay for first-class travel by air for such journeys as may be approved for the successful carrying out of the project.

Application forms and additional information on NATO Advanced Research Fellowships may be obtained from the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.

Applications should be submitted no later than January 3, 1961.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

General Assembly

Economic Development of Under-developed Countries: International Flow of Private Capital. Note by the Secretary-General. A/4487. September 13, 1960. 1 p.;

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

- Question of the Establishment of a United Nations Capital Development Fund. Report by the Secretary-General. A/4488. September 13, 1960. 2 pp.; Methods and Techniques for Carrying out a Study of World Economic Development. Note by the Secretary-General. A/4489. September 13, 1960. 3 pp.
- Notification by the Secretary-General Under Article 12, Paragraph 2, of the Charter. Letter dated September 15, 1960, from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the General Assembly listing matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security being dealt with by the Security Council. A/4493. September 16, 1960. 5 pp.
- Declaration on the Grant of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Submitted by Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. delegation, on September 23, 1960, for consideration by the General Assembly at its 15th session. A/4502 and Corr. 1. September 23, 1960. 14 pp.
- Declaration of the Government of the U.S.S.R. on Disarmament. Submitted for the consideration of the 15th session of the General Assembly. A/4503. September 23, 1960. 15 pp.
- Letter Dated 20 September 1960 From the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia. Addressed to the Secretary-General. A/4504. September 23, 1960. 8 pp.
- Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament. Proposals of the Soviet Government submitted for consideration by the General Assembly at its 15th session by Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Soviet Delegation, on September 23, 1960. A/4505. September 23, 1960. 8 pp.
- Offers by Member States of Study and Training Facilities for Inhabitants of Trust Territories. Report by the Secretary-General. A/4498. September 26, 1960. 18 pp.
- Disarmament and the Situation With Regard to the Fulfillment of General Assembly Resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 on the Question of Disarmament. Letter dated September 26, 1960, from Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of the Ministers of the U.S.S.R., addressed to the President of the General Assembly. A/4509. September 26, 1960. 2 pp.
- Offers by Member States of Study and Training Facilities for Inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (Under Resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954). Report by the Secretary-General. A/4473/Add. 1 and Corr. 1. September 27, 1960. 2 pp.
- Letter Dated 28 September 1960 From the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. Addressed to the President of the General Assembly With a Memorandum From a Delegation of the Congolese Parliament to Mr. Dayal, U.N. Special Representative in the Congo. A/4518. September 28, 1960. 3 pp.
- Letter Dated 28 September 1960 From the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations Addressed to the President of the General Assembly. A/4519. September 29, 1960. 4 pp.
- Adoption of the Agenda of the Fifteenth Regular Session, Allocation of Items and Organization of the Session. First report of the General Committee. A/4520. September 29, 1960. 22 pp.
- Letter Dated 29 September 1960 From the President of Ghana, the Prime Minister of India, the President of Indonesia, the President of the United Arab Republic and the President of Yugoslavia Addressed to the President of the General Assembly. A/4522. September 30, 1960. 2 pp.
- Report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information (Non-Self-Governing Territories). A/4526. October 3, 1960. 9 pp.
- Annual Progress Report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation for 1960. A/4528. October 4, 1960. 16 pp.
- Letter Dated 4 October 1960 From the Chairman of the

Delegation of the United States Addressed to the Secretary-General. A/4529. October 4, 1960. 4 pp.
 Letter Dated 5 October 1960 From the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. Addressed to the President of the General Assembly. A/4532. October 5, 1960. 5 pp.

Security Council

Message Dated 11 September 1960 From the President of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. S/4500/Add. 1. September 11, 1960. 1 p.
 Note Verbale Dated 5 September 1960 From the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. and Note Verbale Dated 10 September 1960 From the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the Secretary-General. S/4503. September 11, 1960. 4 pp.
 Letter Dated 11 September 1960 From the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council. S/4504. September 11, 1960. 3 pp.
 Cable Dated 11 September 1960 Addressed to the Secretary-General by the President of the Republic of the Congo. S/4504/Add. 1. September 11, 1960. 1 p.
 Message Dated 11 September 1960 From the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Congo Addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. S/4505. September 11, 1960. 2 pp.
 Message Dated 11 September 1960 From the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Congo Addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. S/4505/Add. 1, September 13, 1960, 1 p.; Add. 2, September 14, 1960, 2 pp.
 Cable Dated 13 September 1960 From the Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. S/4507. September 13, 1960. 1 p.
 Letter Dated 14 September 1960 From the Secretary of State, Office of the President, Special Representative of the Republic of the Congo to the Security Council, Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4512. September 14, 1960. 1 p.
 Letter Dated 14 September 1960 From the Minister-Delegate of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4514. September 14, 1960. 1 p.
 Letter Dated 14 September 1960 From the Minister-Delegate of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4515. September 14, 1960. 3 pp.
 Letter Dated 14 September 1960 From the Special Delegate of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4517. September 15, 1960. 8 pp.
 Telegram Dated 15 September 1960 From the President of the Republic of the Congo Addressed to the Secretary-General. S/4520. September 16, 1960. 1 p.
 Message Dated 18 September 1960 From the Secretary-General of the United Nations to Mr. M. Tshombe, President of the Provincial Government of Katanga. S/4529. September 21, 1960. 2 pp.
 Letter Dated 20 September 1960 From the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4530 and Corr. 1. September 21, 1960. 2 pp.
 First Progress Report to the Secretary-General From His Special Representative in the Congo, Ambassador Rajeshwar Dayal, 21 September 1960. S/4531 and Corr. 1, 2. September 21, 1960. 38 pp.
 Letter Dated 22 September 1960 From the Head of the Delegation of Mali Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4534. September 23, 1960. 1 p.
 Fourth Report by the Secretary-General on the Implementation of Security Council Resolution S/4387 of 14 July 1960, S/4405 of 22 July 1960 and S/4426 of 9 August 1960. Addendum No. 4. Note verbale dated

23 September 1960 from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General. S/4482/Add. 4. October 3, 1960. 2 pp.
 Letter Dated 30 September 1960 From the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic Addressed to the Secretary-General, Concerning the Declaration Adopted on 29 September 1960 by the Egyptian-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission. S/4547. October 5, 1960. 2 pp.

Economic and Social Council

Report of the Working Group on the Treatment of Non-monetary (Subsistence) Transactions Within the Framework of National Accounts. E/CN.14/60. July 5, 1960. 29 pp.
 World Economic Situation: Ways and Means of Promoting Wider Trade Co-operation Among States. A preliminary report by the Secretary-General. E/3389/Corr. 1/Rev. 1. July 11, 1960. 1 p.
 Economic Development of Under-developed Countries: United Nations Capital Development Fund. Replies received from governments. E/3393/Add. 2, July 11, 1960. 7 pp.; Add. 3, July 14, 1960. 1 p.
 Economic Development of Under-developed Countries: United Nations Conference on New Sources of Energy. Report by the Secretary-General on preparatory action. E/3371/Add. 1. July 14, 1960. 20 pp.
 Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights. Report of the Social Committee. E/3410. July 15, 1960. 3 pp.
 World Economic Situation: Evaluation of Long-Term Economic Projections. Replies of governments and intergovernmental organizations to the questionnaire on long-term economic projections—Norway, Poland, Spain, and Council of Mutual Economic Aid. E/3379/Add. 5. July 18, 1960. 22 pp.
 General Review of the Development and Co-ordination of the Economic, Social and Human Rights Programmes and Activities of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies as a Whole: Appraisal of the Programme of the International Atomic Energy Agency, 1959-1964. E/3346/Corr. 1. July 22, 1960. 2 pp.
 Financial Implications of Actions of the Council: Provisional Summary. Statement submitted by the Secretary-General. E/3414. July 27, 1960. 11 pp.
 Calendar of Conferences for 1961. Report by the Secretary-General. E/3415 and Corr. 1. July 30, 1960. 7 pp.
 Report of the Committee on Questions Relating to the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. E/3418. August 1, 1960. 3 pp.
 International Commodity Problems. Report of the Economic Committee. E/3417/Rev. 1. August 2, 1960. 2 pp.
 Financial Implications of Actions of the Council: Final Summary. Statement by Secretary-General. E/3414/Add. 1/Rev. 1. August 2, 1960. 3 pp.
 Technical Assistance. Report of the Technical Assistance Committee. E/3419. August 2, 1960. 40 pp.
 General Review of the Development and Co-ordination of the Economic, Social and Human Rights Programmes and Activities of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies as a Whole. Report of the Co-ordination Committee. E/3420. August 2, 1960. 25 pp.
 Economic Development of Under-developed Countries: United Nations Capital Development Fund. Replies received from governments pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 1424 (XIV). E/3393/Add. 4. August 26, 1960. 2 pp.
 Social Commission. Report of the *Ad Hoc* Advisory Committee of Experts on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, 25 July-3 August 1960. E/CN.5/345. September 13, 1960. 33 pp.
 The Promotion of the International Flow of Private Capital. Progress report by the Secretary-General. E/3325/Corr. 3. September 15, 1960. 1 p.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aviation

Convention on international civil aviation. Done at Chicago December 7, 1944. Entered into force April 4, 1947. TIAS 1591.

Adherences deposited: Mali, November 8, 1960; Nigeria, November 14, 1960.

Cultural Property

Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Belgium, September 16, 1960.

Accession deposited: Guinea, September 20, 1960.

Protocol for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Belgium, September 16, 1960.

Finance

Agreement amending the administrative agreement of December 1, 1954 (TIAS 3233), concerning the Arbitral Tribunal and Mixed Commission under the agreement on German external debts of February 27, 1953 (TIAS 2792). Done at Bonn August 29, 1960. Entered into force August 29, 1960.

Signatures: France, Federal Republic of Germany, United Kingdom, and United States, August 29, 1960.

Germany

Charter of the arbitral commission on property, rights, and interests in Germany (annex to convention on settlement of matters arising out of the war and occupation signed at Bonn May 26, 1952, as amended). Entered into force May 5, 1955. TIAS 3425.

Accession deposited: Denmark, October 18, 1960.

Sugar

International sugar agreement, 1958. Done at London December 1, 1958. Entered into force January 1, 1959. TIAS 4389.

Application to: Land Berlin with effect from January 1, 1959, the date on which the agreement entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with six annexes and final protocol. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959.¹

Accession deposited: Dahomey, October 28, 1960.

Weather

Convention of the World Meteorological Organization. Done at Washington October 11, 1947. Entered into force March 23, 1950. TIAS 2052.

Accessions deposited: Congo (Léopoldville), November 5, 1960; Mali and Senegal, November 11, 1960.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

BILATERAL

Finland

Agreement amending the agreement of July 2, 1952, as amended (TIAS 2555, 3704, and 4241), for financing certain educational exchange programs. Effected by exchange of notes at Helsinki November 14, 1960. Entered into force November 14, 1960.

France

Convention of establishment, protocol, and declaration. Signed at Paris November 25, 1959.

Ratifications exchanged: November 21, 1960.

Enters into force: December 21, 1960.

Indonesia

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchanges of notes. Signed at Djakarta November 5, 1960. Entered into force November 5, 1960.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Recess Appointments

The President on November 12 appointed Francis H. Russell to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 641 dated November 14.)

Designations

Herman H. Barger as Deputy Special Assistant for Communist Economic Affairs, effective October 30.

Philip W. Bonsal as Interim Representative of the United States on the Council of the Organization of American States, effective November 15.

John C. Guthrie as Deputy Director, Office of Soviet Union Affairs, effective November 9.

Resignations

George V. Allen as Director of the United States Information Agency, effective December 1. (For an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Mr. Allen, see White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated November 11.)

James D. Zellerbach as Ambassador to Italy. (For an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Ambassador Zellerbach, see White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated November 20.)

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

International Educational Exchange Program, January 1-June 30, 1959. Pub. 7001. International Information and Cultural Series 72. 49 pp. Limited distribution.

The 23rd semiannual report to Congress summarizing the exchange activities carried out during the second half of fiscal year 1959.

Publications of the Department of State, January 1, 1958-December 31, 1959. Pub. 7003. 74 pp. 45¢.

This catalog of numbered publications also includes a list of the publications distribution centers and periodicals of the Department of State.

Documents on Disarmament, 1945-1959. Volume I (1945-56) and Volume II (1957-59). Pub. 7008. xxxviii, 1644 pp. \$4.50 a set.

A two-volume set containing important postwar documents regarding negotiations on international control of atomic energy, the reduction of armaments and armed forces, safeguards against surprise attack, the problem of nuclear weapons tests, various problems of outer space, and related questions.

Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences, July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959. Pub. 7012. International Organization and Conference Series 11. xxvi, 296 pp. \$1.

This volume is a reference guide to the official participation of the U.S. Government in multilateral international conferences and meetings of international organizations during the period July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959.

U.S. Participation in the UN—Report by the President to the Congress for the Year 1959. Pub. 7016. International Organization and Conference Series 12. xvii, 282 pp. 75¢.

The 14th annual report, covering U.S. participation in the United Nations and the specialized agencies during the year 1959.

Economic Assistance and Progress in Thailand. Pub. 7017. Far Eastern Series 95. 11 pp. 10¢.

Address by U. Alexis Johnson, Ambassador to Thailand, made before the American Association at Bangkok, Thailand, on May 11, 1960.

Questions and Answers on the Mutual Security Program. Pub. 7027. General Foreign Policy Series 152. 29 pp. 15¢.

A series of questions and answers describing the purpose, scope of activities, and cost of the program, together with excerpts from President Eisenhower's message to Congress on its importance.

Sample Questions from the Foreign Service Officer Examination (Revised). Pub. 7037. Department and Foreign Service Series 94. 37 pp. Limited distribution.

A pamphlet presenting samples of the kinds of questions which will be asked in the written examination given

each candidate for appointment as a Foreign Service officer.

Activities Under the Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations. Pub. 7045. International Information and Cultural Series 73. 3 pp. Limited distribution.

This pamphlet describes the reorganization by the Department of State of its offices dealing with international educational and cultural activities, effective April 17, 1960.

Career Opportunities as a Foreign Service Officer (Revised). Pub. 7047. Department and Foreign Service Series 95. 30 pp. 15¢.

A pamphlet describing the opportunities existing for young men and women to become career officers in the Foreign Service of the United States.

Disarmament at a Glance. Pub. 7058. General Foreign Policy Series 154. 21 pp. 20¢.

This pamphlet summarizes the positions of the United States, the Allied powers, and the Soviet bloc on various aspects of the problem of arms limitation and control as they stood on June 27, 1960.

The UN—Meeting Place of Nations (Revised). Pub. 7074. International Organization and Conference Series 15. 12 pp. 10¢.

This pamphlet describes in brief the activities of the United Nations in such areas as economic and technical assistance, peaceful uses of atomic energy, and building world understanding.

Air Service—Lease of Equipment—Return of Certain Items. TIAS 4490. 13 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, extending the agreement of August 2, 1955, as extended. Exchange of notes—Dated at Bonn November 3, 1959, and January 8, 1960. Entered into force January 8, 1960. Operative retroactively August 2, 1959.

Technical Cooperation. TIAS 4491. 11 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Uruguay. Signed at Montevideo March 23, 1956. Entered into force March 22, 1960.

Technical Cooperation and Economic Development—Application in the United Arab Republic of Agreements of May 5, 1951, February 23 and 24, 1954, and November 6, 1954. TIAS 4492. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic. Exchange of notes—Signed at Cairo April 2, 1960. Entered into force April 2, 1960.

Air Force and Army Missions to Honduras. TIAS 4494. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Honduras, extending and amending the agreements of March 6, 1950, as extended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Tegucigalpa April 22 and May 20, 1960. Entered into force May 20, 1960. Operative retroactively March 6, 1958.

Copyright. TIAS 4496. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Austria. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 15, 1960. Entered into force June 15, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4497. 14 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Yugoslavia. Signed at Belgrade June 3, 1960. Entered into force June 3, 1960. With exchanges of letters.

Defense—Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4500. 12 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Greece. Exchange of notes—Signed at Athens February 15, 1960. Entered into force February 15, 1960. With exchange of notes—Signed at Athens February 15 and 24, 1960. And agreement amending the agreement of February 15, 1960. Exchange of notes—Signed at Athens June 3, 1960. Entered into force June 3, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4501. 16 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Chile. Signed at Santiago June 2, 1960. Entered into force June 2, 1960. With memorandum of understanding and exchanges of notes.

Establishment of Long Range Aid to Navigation (Loran) Station in the Bahama Islands. TIAS 4502. 15 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Signed at Washington June 24, 1960. Entered into force June 24, 1960.

United States Educational Foundation in Norway. TIAS 4503. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Norway, amending agreement of May 25, 1949, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Oslo June 21, 1960. Entered into force June 21, 1960.

Defense—Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4504. 13 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany. Exchange of notes—Signed at Bonn May 27, 1960. Entered into force May 27, 1960. With understanding effected by exchange of notes.

Grant of Certain Nuclear Research Equipment in the Field of Agriculture. TIAS 4505. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and India. Exchange of notes—Dated at New Delhi April 22 and June 13, 1960. Entered into force June 13, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4506. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Pakistan, supplementing the agreement of November 26, 1958, as amended and supplemented. Signed at Rawalpindi May 27, 1960. Entered into force May 27, 1960. With exchange of notes.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 4507. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Israel, amending the agreement of July 12, 1955, as amended. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force July 8, 1960.

Grant for Procurement of Nuclear Research and Training Equipment and Materials. TIAS 4508. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Argentina. Exchange of notes—Signed at Buenos Aires September 9, 1959, and May 23, 1960. Entered into force May 23, 1960.

Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. TIAS 4509. 20 pp. 15¢.

Between the United States of America and Japan. Signed at Washington January 19, 1960. Entered into force June 23, 1960. With agreed minute and exchanges of notes.

Agreement Under Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. TIAS 4510. 106 pp. 35¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Japan. Signed at Washington January 19, 1960. Entered into force June 23, 1960. With agreed minutes and exchange of notes.

Mutual Defense Assistance—References in Agreement of March 8, 1954, to Security Treaty and Administrative Agreement. TIAS 4511. 2 pp. 5¢.

Understanding between the United States of America and Japan. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington January 19, 1960. Entered into force June 23, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4512. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Indonesia, amending the agreement of March 2, 1956, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Djakarta February 18 and March 11, 1959. Entered into force March 11, 1959.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4513. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Israel, supplementing the agreement of January 7, 1960. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 30, 1960. Entered into force June 30, 1960.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 4514. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and China, amending the agreement of July 18, 1955, as amended. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force July 15, 1960.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 4515. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, amending the agreement of July 27, 1955. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force July 15, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4516. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Indonesia, amending the agreement of May 29, 1959. Exchange of notes—Dated at Djakarta May 23 and June 8, 1960. Entered into force June 8, 1960.

Emergency Relief Assistance. TIAS 4517. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Chile. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 29, 1960. Entered into force June 29, 1960.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 4518. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Canada, amending the agreement of June 15, 1955, as amended and modified. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force July 14, 1960.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses. TIAS 4519. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Portugal, amending the agreement of July 21, 1955, as amended. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force July 19, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4520. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Viet-Nam, amending the agreement of October 16, 1959, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Saigon June 30, 1960. Entered into force June 30, 1960.

Albania. Albanian Independence Day	889	Publications. Recent Releases	913
American Republics. Bonsal designated interim U.S. representative of the OAS Council	912	Refugees. President Asks Mr. Voorhees To Study Cuban Refugee Problem	888
Communism. Barger designated Deputy Special Assistant for Communist Economic Affairs	912	Treaty Information	
Congo, Republic of the. U.N. General Assembly Accepts Credentials of Congolese President Kasavubu (Barco, Wadsworth)	904	Current Actions	912
Cuba. President Asks Mr. Voorhees To Study Cuban Refugee Problem	888	U.S., France Exchange Ratifications of Convention of Establishment	902
Department and Foreign Service		Turkey. United States To Assist Turkey in Financing Imports	901
Designations (Barger, Bonsal, Guthrie)	912	U.S.S.R. Guthrie designated Deputy Director, Office of Soviet Union Affairs	912
Recess Appointments (Russell)	912	United Kingdom. Stage-Two Talks on West Indies Bases Open on Island of Tobago	889
Resignations (Allen, Zellerbach)	912	United Nations	
Economic Affairs		Current U.N. Documents	910
GATT Contracting Parties Conclude 17th Session	894	U.N. General Assembly Accepts Credentials of Congolese President Kasavubu (Barco, Wadsworth)	904
President Concurs in Tariff Findings on Lead and Zinc Import Quota	901	West Indies, The. Stage-Two Talks on West Indies Bases Open on Island of Tobago	889
Some Aspects of Private Foreign Investment (Hager)	890		
Trade Committee Supplements Notice on GATT Negotiations	897		
U.S., France Exchange Ratifications of Convention of Establishment	902		
Educational and Cultural Affairs			
Department and U.S. Medical Agencies Discuss Training of Foreign Doctors	902		
NATO Research Fellowship Program Announced for 1961-62	909		
France. U.S., France Exchange Ratifications of Convention of Establishment	902		
Ghana. Russell appointed Ambassador	912		
Guatemala. U.S. Positions Naval Units as Aid to Guatemala and Nicaragua (Hagerty)	888		
Health, Education, and Welfare. Department and U.S. Medical Agencies Discuss Training of Foreign Doctors	902		
International Organizations and Conferences			
Bonsal designated interim U.S. representative on the OAS Council	912		
GATT Contracting Parties Conclude 17th Session	894		
Trade Committee Supplements Notice on GATT Negotiations	897		
Italy. Zellerbach resigns as Ambassador	912		
Military Affairs. Stage-Two Talks on West Indies Bases Open on Island of Tobago	889		
Mutual Security. United States To Assist Turkey in Financing Imports	901		
Nicaragua. U.S. Positions Naval Units as Aid to Guatemala and Nicaragua (Hagerty)	888		
North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO Research Fellowship Program Announced for 1961-62	909		
Public Affairs. Foreign Policy and News Responsibility (Berding)	883		

Name Index

Allen, George V.	912
Barco, James W.	904
Barger, Herman H.	912
Berding, Andrew H.	883
Bonsal, Philip W.	912
Guthrie, John C.	912
Hager, Eric H.	890
Hagerty, James C.	888
Russell, Francis H.	912
Wadsworth, James J.	906
Zellerbach, James D.	912

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: November 21-27

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Releases issued prior to November 21 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 643 of November 15 and 647 and 649 of November 18.

No.	Date	Subject
652	11/21	Convention of establishment with France.
653	11/21	Report of delegation to 17th GATT session.
654	11/23	NATO research fellowship program.
655	11/23	Tripartite talks on West Indies bases.
†656	11/23	Delegation heads of new U.N. members tour U.S.
657	11/25	Financial aid to Turkey.
658	11/25	Albanian independence day.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Three new publications on the Mutual Security Program . . .

Questions and Answers on the Mutual Security Program

This 29-page illustrated booklet contains the answers to the most important questions asked about the Mutual Security Program.

Publication 7027

15 cents

Technical Cooperation in Education

This booklet reports U.S. efforts to help the newly developing countries to establish educational systems patterned to meet their needs. More than 40 nations have asked for and are receiving U.S. aid in education.

Publication 7024

15 cents

Technical Cooperation in Industry

The people of the newly developing nations look toward the United States for the knowledge and skills to help them achieve the industrial growth which will bring them a higher standard of living. This 23-page illustrated booklet tells the story of U.S. technical cooperation in industry in these countries.

Publication 7023

15 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me _____ copies of—

Questions and Answers on the Mutual Security Program.
Technical Cooperation in Education.
Technical Cooperation in Industry.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

VOID